DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 120 EA 021 778

AUTHOR Mitchell, Douglas E.
TITLE Labor Relations in California As Seen by Members of the Association of California School Administrators: A Survey Conducted by the Far West Laboratory.
INSTITUTION Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Mar 87
CONTRACT 400-86-009
NOTE 80p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Collective Bargaining; Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Labor Relations; *Surveys; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Unions
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

In May 1985, the Representative Assembly of the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) adopted a resolution calling for a comprehensive review of labor relations among teachers, school boards, and school management. The Far West Laboratory was engaged to design a survey of ACSA members. A questionnaire was designed and circulated to a 25 percent random sample of active ACSA members (3,105 administrators) in November 1986. The usable response rate was 1,275, or 10.3 percent of the active ACSA membership. The questionnaire consisted of 97 questions covering 11 areas of labor relations practice, experience, and opinion. The data demonstrate that administrators are broadly experienced with the basic elements of labor relations: proposal development, negotiations, contract administration, and grievance resolution. However, considerable confusion was found concerning the "confidential employee" concept and the identity of the chief management spokesperson in teacher negotiations. Many administrators disclosed knowledge gaps regarding negotiations history and contract content. Administrators seemed less troubled than expected by collective bargaining. Although unenthusiastic about collective bargaining's contribution to education, administrators do feel that cooperation is possible and that teacher organizations could provide significant leadership in schools. Further examination of interrelationships among responses, such as the "trust syndrome" covered in this report, is recommended. Two appendices contain the survey instrument and data tables. (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED318120

FAR WEST LABORATORY
FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

LABOR RELATIONS IN CALIFORNIA

AS SEEN BY

MEMBERS OF THE

ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

A Survey Conducted by the Far West Laboratory

Douglas E. Mitchell

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

March, 1987

EA 021 778

1855 FOLSOM STREET · SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103 · (415) 565-3000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The research in this document was jointly supported by funds from the Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), contract number 400-86-009 and by the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA). The opinions expressed by the author are his own and do not imply endorsement by either the United States Government or by ACSA.

FAR WEST LABORATORY
FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

LABOR RELATIONS IN CALIFORNIA

AS SEEN BY

MEMBERS OF THE

ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

A Survey Conducted by the Far West Laboratory

Douglas E. Mitchell

March, 1987

1855 FOLSOM STREET · SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103 · (415) 565-3000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

A. The Objective of the Study 1

II. Design and Conduct of the Survey 1

A. The Survey Instrument 2
B. Survey Procedures 3
C. Are Respondents Representative? 4
1. Sample by County 4
2. Sample by Gender and Position 4
3. Confidential Employee Status 5

III. Looking at the Respondents 6

A. Position, Location and Tenure 6
B. Age, Gender and Education 7
C. Labor Relations Experience 8

IV. Labor Relations Practices in California 8

A. Union Representation - Management Spokespersons 9
B. Current Conditions: Salaries, Finances, Status 10
C. Negotiation Topics 10
D. Labor Problems: Strikes, Grievances, etc. .. 12
E. Non-Contractual Agreements 13

V. Alternative Labor Practices 14

A. Who Reported the Existence of Alternative Practices? 15
B. Three Types of Alternative Practices 16

VI. Opinions About Collective Bargaining 17

A. Its Impact on Education 17
B. Its Impact on Trust 18
C. Impact on District Management 19

VII. Views of Teacher Organizations 21

A. Teacher Organization Strength and Character 21
B. The Focus and Direction of Action 22

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

VIII. Management Self-Understanding 23

A. Overall Management Orientation 23
B. Management Effectiveness 24
C. Community and Board Support 25

IX. Views of the School Board 25

A. The Political Context of Board Decision-making 25
B. The Boards' General Orientation to Education 27
C. Board Views on Labor Relations Issues and Actions 27

X. Looking for Patterns in Administrator Views 28

XI. The Trust Syndrome 29

A. Trust and Objective Labor Relations Problems 29
B. Trust and Views of the Teacher Organization.. 31
C. Trust and Views of District Management 32
D. Trust and Views of the School Board 33
E. A Syndrome, Not a Causal Analysis 34

XII. Conclusion 35

APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT 37

APPENDIX B: TABLES 44

Table 1: County Distribution of Membership and Responses 44
Table 2: ACSA Membership and Sample Response Rate by Gender and by Job Title 45
Table 3: ACSA Memberships and Sample Response Rate by Confidential Employee Status 45

(Responses of all individuals to each question in the ACSA Labor Relations Questionnaire) .. 46

Table 4: Views of Teacher Organizations ... 47
Table 5: Views of District Management 48
Table 6: Views of Local School Boards 49

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

APPENDIX B: TABLES (continued)

Table 7A:	Opinions on Labor Relations Issues	50
Table 7B:	Views on Labor Relations Issues	51
Table 8A:	Topics of Frequent Negotiation	52
Table 8B:	Topics of Frequent Negotiation	53
Table 9:	Topics of Non-Contractual Agreements	54
Table 10:	Personal Background and Experience	55
Table 11:	Personal Labor Relations Experiences	56
Table 12:	Labor Relations Practices and Alternatives	57

(Responses to the ACSA Labor Relations Questionnaire aggregated by district)

Table 13:	Views of Teacher Organizations	59
Table 14:	Views of SchoolDistrict Management	60
Table 15:	Views of School Boards	61
Table 16A:	Labor Relations Opinions	62
Table 16B:	Labor Relations Opinions	63
Table 17A:	Frequency of Negotiating Various Issues	64
Table 17B:	Frequency of Negotiating Various Issues	65
Table 18:	Frequency of Non-Contractual Agreements	66
Table 19:	Labor Relations Conditions and Practices	67
Table 20:	Labor Relations Practices	68
Table 21:	Stepwise Multiple Regression Equation as Predicted by Various Objective labor relations problems	69
Table 22:	Stepwise Multiple Regression Equation as Predicted by Views Regarding Teacher Organizations	70
Table 23:	Stepwise Multiple Regression Equation as Predicted by Views Regarding District Management	71
Table 25:	Stepwise Multiple Regression Equation as Predicted by Views Regarding Teachers, Management and School Board	73

I. Introduction

In May of 1985 the Representative Assembly of the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) adopted a resolution calling for a comprehensive review of labor relations between teachers, school boards and school management. In response to this resolution Dr. Douglas E. Mitchell of the Far West Laboratory, San Francisco, was engaged to design and conduct a survey of ACSA members.

In collaboration with a special ACSA Labor Relations Advisory Committee, a questionnaire was designed and circulated to a sample of ACSA members in November, 1986. This report summarizes the results of that survey.

A. The Objective of the Study

As expressed in the Representative Assembly resolution, the primary purpose of the study was:

> to determine the current state of collective bargaining in California and to determine what approaches could be use to enhance personnel management, including employer-employee relations, and to promote cooperation within the profession.

II. Design and Conduct of the Survey

The questionnaire developed for this survey was based on a combination of the practical insights into labor relations issues and problems provided by the special ACSA Labor Relations Advisory Committee (LRAC) and an extensive review of the research literature on this topic. Following preparation of a preliminary conceptual framework for the survey instrument, the LRAC met in August of 1986 to provide guidance for a draft questionnaire. The draft was circulated for revision and comment by the Committee and presented to the October, 1986 meeting of the ACSA Representative Assembly. Based on feedback from these reviews and pilot testing with a small group of administrators, the instrument was revised and prepared for distribution in November.

A. The Survey Instrument

The final questionnaire consisted of 97 questions covering eleven different areas of labor relations practice, experience and opinion. A copy of the actual instrument is attached (see Appendix A). The eleven areas covered include:

1. Labor relations history and conditions.

   Questions in this area covered experiences with grievances, impasses and strikes; information on the number of multi-year contracts negotiated and the number of days lost to work stoppage throughout the ten year history of the Rodda act; and the union (if any) representing teachers.

2. Current district fiscal and bargaining status.

   The financial health of the district, the level of teacher salaries compared to similar districts, the current state of teacher negotiations, and the identity of the chief management spokesperson during negotiations.

3. Topics addressed in teacher negotiations.

   Respondents were asked to indicate how difficult it was to reach agreement with the teacher organization on 15 of the most frequently negotiated contractual issues.

4. Topics covered in non-contractual agreements with teachers.

   Respondents were also asked to report on whether agreements with the teacher organization in their school district had been reached on any of ten additional topics -- ones less frequently covered in formal contracts.

5. Personal background and experience data.

   Eight questions asked about the respondents' age, gender, education, administrative position, tenure in current job, school location (if at a site), and whether or not they are identified as a confidential employee.

6. Personal experience with labor relations.
   Four questions regarding whether respondents had experience in preparing proposals, negotiating contracts, exposure to strikes, and whether they had personally been the object of a grievance.

7. Opinions about the value and impact of collective bargaining for teachers.

   Fourteen questions covering respondents' personal assessments of collective bargaining for teachers. Questions included an assessment of the level of trust between teachers and managers, whether bargaining has beneficial or harmful effects, and whether teachers organizations can be expected to provide educational leadership in the schools.

8. Assessment of the local teacher organization.

   Eleven questions covering the leadership and activities of the local teacher organization.

9. Assessment of district management.

   Ten questions on the capacity and orientation of district management.

10. Assessment of local school boards.

    Ten questions on the political conditions, labor relations orientations, and general policy views of the local school boards.

11. Identification of alternative labor relations practices.

    Four questions asked respondents to indicate whether any significant departures from typical industrial unionism were to be found in their districts, and, if so, what these departures were like and whether they were successful.

B. Survey Procedures

The survey was sent by the ACSA office to 3,105 school administrators -- a 25% sample of the organization's active membership. Respondents were selected at random from the November, 1986 ACSA master membership file (selection was made from among active members only).

A total of 1,307 (42%) of the questionnaires were returned. Of this number, 32 were unusable leaving 1,275 (10.3% of the active ACSA membership) for data analysis. Of the usable questionnaires, 1,030 were returned without follow-up reminders. The other 245 came in response to a follow-up reminder in January, 1987. When early and late respondents were compared, no substantial differences in their response patterns could be identified.

Several tests were made to determine whether the 1,275 respondents used for data analysis are truly representative of the ACSA membership as a whole.

C. Are Respondents Representative?

Questionnaires were returned from 503 of California's 1,022 school districts. As expected, the largest number came from the state's largest school district (38 from Los Angeles Unified). Among the smaller districts, 262 were represented by a single respondent. An average of 3.6 questionnaires were received from the remaining districts (actual numbers ranged from 2 to 17).

1. Sample by County

As shown in Table 1 (see Appendix B), 57 of California's 58 counties are represented in the sample (there are only 2 ACSA members in the remaining county). As the data in Table 1 reveal, the respondent group is distributed appropriately across the counties. In all of the large counties, response rates ranged from 8% to 12% of the ACSA membership working in the county. Large deviations from the expected 10.3% responses rate for the entire state are found only in counties with relatively few administrators.

2. Sample by Gender and Position

The adequacy of the sample was also checked by comparing the gender and position data from the questionnaires with that found in the ACSA membership file. Table 2 (Appendix B) shows the distribution by gender and position for the primary district and site level administrative positions. The six position classifications shown (superintendent/assistant supt., business mgr/controller, personnel officer, supervisor/

coordinator, principal/assistant principal, and vice principal/dean) account for 1,171 of the respondents. An additional 104 respondents had different job titles or did not provide both job and gender information. The ACSA membership data reported in Table 2 is also incomplete. About 2% of the ACSA membership do not report their gender, and we have no way of knowing how non-reporting members are distributed.

The data on this table indicate some unevenness in response by both gender and position. Women responded less frequently than men (an average of 11.2% of the female ACSA members in the identified positions, compared with 13.2% response rate for the men). More noticeably, except for the individuals holding the position of business manager or controller, central office administrators were more likely to be found in the final sample than site administrators. The 30.1% return rate for females holding district level supervisor or coordinator positions indicates that this group was somewhat over-sampled. In all other cases, it is impossible to determine whether higher response rates were the result of over-sampling or a greater willingness to fill out and return the questionnaire.

In general, the modest differences in response rate by gender and position do not pose significant data analysis problems. Except for the business manager/controller group, low response rates are from the very large sub-groups in the population. Moreover, except for this group the total number of respondents in each response group are quite large. The small adjustments that would result from weighing responses to eliminate position or gender bias would not significantly alter the findings described in this report. Moreover, the small technical improvement gotten by weighing responses is more than offset by our inability to know whether the large number of non respondents in each category would hold views exactly like those who returned completed questionnaires.

3. Confidential Employee Status

A third area where we expected to use ACSA membership records to check on the representativeness of the respondent sample concerns the classification of various administrators as Confidential Employees under terms of the Rodda Act. As shown in Table 3, however, the data on this question reveals that there is widespread confusion about the meaning of this term. While ACSA records show only 8 male and 418 female

administrators classified as Confidential Employees, 342 men (almost 42 times the number in the files) and 167 women (40% of the total in the files) indicated on their questionnaires that they are so classified. Examination of the questionnaires reveals that many principals, superintendents and assistant superintendents indicated that they are Confidential Employees -- apparently not understanding that this is a legal classification. Hence, the data from this question cannot be further analyzed, and do not help us to know whether the respondents appropriately represent the ACSA membership as a whole.

III. Looking at the Respondents

Once it has been established that the respondents represent a fair cross-section of the ACSA membership, the next step in data analysis is to examine the personal characteristics of the respondent group.

A. Position, Location and Tenure

Table 10 in Appendix B shows the responses to questions about each administrator's current job (Questions #72 and #73), school type (Question #75) and tenure in current position (Question #76). More than half of all respondents (56%) reported working as school site principals, assistant principals, vice principals or deans. Curiously, this is more than the total number reporting that they do not work in district offices (53.9%). The explanation lies in the fact that some 107 individuals hold assignments at both the district office and one or more school sites. Of these, 35 are both superintendents and principals, 29 combine the principalship with some other district office assignment, and 24 hold multiple assignments not including the principalship. Only 19 individuals reported working at neither a district office or a school site.

Of the 762 individuals who work full or part time at one or more school sites, about four in ten (42%) are at elementary schools, two in ten (18%) are at middle or junior high schools, and three in ten (29%) at high schools. The remaining one-tenth are either at special schools (7%) or serve more than one school (about 4%).

In reporting tenure in their current jobs, respondents documented a moderate turnover in administrative staff in the schools. Nearly a quarter

of all administrators have been in their current job less than 2 years. At the other end of the spectrum, a slightly larger number have been in their current jobs for 10 or more years.

Also shown on the table are the answers to Question #74 asking whether the respondents were classified as Confidential Employees. As indicated previously, many more administrators indicated that they were so classified than are found in the ACSA membership, hence these answers must mean that they <u>feel</u> they have the confidence of their superiors or the school board -- not that they have this legal status.

B. Age, Gender and Education

In the bottom part of Table 10 are statistics showing how respondents answered questions regarding their gender (Question #77), age (Question #78) and level of education (Question #79). In each case, the data fit what we know about the general characteristics of public school administrators. For example, the fact that school administration is largely a male occupation is sharply underscored. Two of every three respondents were male. Remember, however, that ACSA membership records indicate that males responded somewhat more frequently to the questionnaire, hence the numbers in this table slightly over-estimate the ratio of men to women.

The age profile of ACSA members is distributed quite evenly in the 40 to 60 year age range. As shown in Table 10, approximately 20% of the respondents fell into each of the five year periods of this age range. Much smaller numbers are found in the younger and older age bands. About 13% are in the 35 to 39 range, nearly 5% over 60, and less than 3% under 35.

California school administrators are a very well educated group of people. Nearly all administrators (93.3%) report completing at least a masters degree. And more than one in six (17%) has completed a doctoral degree.

C. Labor Relations Experience

The first four entries in Table 11 describe the direct labor relations experiences of ACSA members. The answers given indicate that California administrators are broadly experienced in the basic elements of bargaining and contract administration. The most common contact with the technical aspects of collective bargaining is in the preparation of contract proposals. Nearly two-thirds of all respondents have participated in the development of negotiation proposals (Question #81). Of this number, most have prepared management proposals; nearly a third have worked on both teacher and management proposals. Only about one in ten have worked only on teacher proposals.

A majority of administrators (55%) have also served on negotiating teams (Question #82). Again the great majority have worked on management teams, but a substantial group have also had experience as teacher negotiators. Only 8.3% of the respondents have worked on teacher bargaining teams without also working on a management team.

Substantial numbers of administrators have had to deal with the most tension laden aspects of labor relations -- strikes and defending themselves against grievances. Nearly half (44.7%) of all respondents have been employed in a district experiencing a strike (Question #80). About twice as many have been through strikes as administrators as were employed as teachers at the time. Only a few have experienced strikes as both teachers and managers.

The least frequently reported contact with the labor relations system was being the object of a grievance (Question #83). Nevertheless, fully a third of all respondents reported that they had personally been the object of a grievance. This is a surprisingly large number, given the fact nearly 50% of all respondents said that their districts have experienced no more than one grievance during the past 12 months.

IV. Labor Relations Practices in California

In this section we examine the basic elements of labor relations in California school districts. The data reported here were derived by averaging responses from all individuals in the same district. Of the 1,275 individuals in the total sample, 137 did not report their district code. The remaining 1,138 work for a

total of 503 school districts. Hence, throughout this section, we are reviewing the distribution of various characteristics within these 503 school districts. Tables 13 through 22 summarize the distribution of districts on all relevant survey questions. Only some of these variables are discussed here, the others are included so that anyone wishing further information can study the tables.

A. Union Representation - Management Spokespersons

Two questions were asked regarding the formal structures of labor relations: the name of the union organization that is the exclusive representative of district teachers, and the identity of the chief management spokesperson during negotiations. On both questions, there was some disagreement among individuals from the same school district regarding union representation and management leadership. In 23 of the 241 districts (9.5%) with more than one respondent there was some disagreement about which union represents the teachers. In most cases (18) the split would not be considered serious because only one respondent gave a divergent answer while all others agreed to a common answer.

Disagreement regarding the chief management spokesperson was much more serious. In 132 (55%) of the cases involving multiple respondents there was disagreement over the identity of the chief negotiator for management. Of these 132 cases, 42 involved disagreement among just two respondents and 47 involved a single dissent among 3 or more respondents, but 27 included cases where three or more different answers were given to this question and 16 involved multiple selections for each of two different management spokesperson responses. It is a safe bet, that in about half the districts in California there is some confusion among members of the administrative staff about who actually is the chief management spokesperson during collective bargaining negotiations.

Within the limits of reliability, Table 19, Question #84, shows that teachers in nearly 90% of all California school districts are represented by an affiliate of the California Teachers Association (441 districts). Thirty-five districts (7% of the total) are represented by California Federation of Teachers affiliates. One district (Los Angeles) is represented by the United Teachers of Los Angeles. Eleven districts

report some other union representation and 14 (just under 3% of the sample) report that they have no teacher union.

Best estimates on the question of chief management spokesperson are shown on Table 20 (Question #94). District leadership is most often provided by outside consultants (28.8%). When outsiders are not involved, negotiating leadership is rather evenly divided among the superintendents (25.2%), personnel managers (22.7%) and various other staff persons (21.1%). No more than 11 districts in the sample (2%) were represented in negotiations by school board members.

B. Current Conditions: Salaries, Finance, Status

Questions #85, #86 and #87 on Table 19 identify current conditions within school districts throughout the state. Question #85 asked how respondents compare teacher salaries in their own district with those of comparable size and type. Not surprisingly, administrators tend to compare themselves with districts which make their own salary levels look good. Nearly half the districts estimate their salary levels to be either somewhat or much higher than those in comparable districts. Only 15% see their own salaries as below the average of comparable districts.

When it comes to assessing their current financial condition, administrators are more conservative. Only one district in three reported their financial condition to be "sound" or "comfortable." Nearly 40% reported their budgets to be "tight" or troubled." It is important to keep in mind that most respondents made these assessments before the Governor's 1987-88 budget was announced.

In response to Question #87, two-thirds of the districts reported that contract negotiations had been completed. Of the remaining one-third, most (21.2%) were actively negotiating. About one district in ten was at impasse and two of the 503 districts were facing work stoppages.

C. Negotiation Topics

As shown on Tables 17A and 17B, respondents were asked to indicate whether negotiations had taken place, and if so how difficult it was to reach agreement on 15 different topics typically covered in contracts

(Questions #47 through #62 on the questionnaire). The response rates for these questions was generally high (in the 80 to 90% range). The one exception was the item on negotiation of staffing ratios for specialists -- slightly less than 70% of the administrators surveyed responded to this question.

Responses to these 15 questions have been arranged on Tables 17A and 17B in accordance with the frequency with which agreements were actually reached. Thus, the responses to Question #49, Basic Teacher Salaries, is shown first because 99.6% of the districts reported reaching agreement on this issue. Only 2 school districts reported not reaching agreement on teacher salaries. As might be expected, this topic was most frequently reported to be an issue in an impasse or strike. More than one in five districts report going to impasse over teacher salaries.

Fringe benefits packages were the next most frequently settled negotiation issue. All but seven districts (1.4%) reported agreement on fringe benefits. While this topic was also reported as a frequent impasse or strike issue, it reached this point only 11.1% of the time, about half as often as basic salaries.

Between 80% and 90 % of all districts reported reaching agreement on four topics: the length of the school day or year (Question #61), teacher evaluation plans (Question #56), teacher assignment and transfer rules (Question #48), and the assignment of extra duties (Question #51). In each case, more than 60% of all districts reported reaching agreement on these issues with moderate or little difficulty. The length of the school day or year was the only issue to have become an issue in impasse or strike in more than 5% of the districts surveyed. Teacher assignment and transfer was reported to be difficult to settle, although it only rarely reached impasse.

From 70% to 80% of all districts reported reaching agreement on the next four issues: extra duty compensation (Question #52), class size (Question #47), mentor teacher programs (Question #55), and teacher preparation time (Question #59). Among these topics, the mentor teacher program was, if negotiated at all, the easiest to settle. In each of the other cases 15% to 20% of all districts reported that the issue was settled with great difficulty or became the object of impasse or strike.

About two-thirds of all districts reported reaching agreement on the use of lottery funds (Question #60) and the development of teacher discipline procedures (Question #58). If negotiated, settlement on these two issues did not generally come easily. About a third of those who negotiated lottery fund expenditures found agreement very difficult to reach, and about one-quarter of those negotiating teacher discipline procedures settled with great difficulty or went to impasse.

Less than half of all districts reported negotiating agreements on staff development plans (Question #57), staffing ratios for specialists (Question #53), or merit/performance pay plans (Question #54). Merit pay was the least frequently negotiated of all the issues queried -- only one district in eight negotiated on this issue.

We should note that the survey did not ask about the specifics of any agreement reached. It impossible to tell from this data whether easy agreements resulted from giving teachers what they asked for or from having an accommodating teacher organization that did not make extensive demands. Moreover, we do not know whether issues that went to impasse or strike were eventually settled, or which side "won" in the settlement.

D. Labor Problems: Strikes, Grievances, etc.

Questions #88 through #93 on Tables 19 and 20 show the distribution of various labor relations problems across school districts. It is important to note the frequency with which administrators indicated that they did not know, or simply did not answer the questions regarding the number of grievances, impasses or strikes experienced by their school districts. Apparently this information is not common knowledge in many districts. The number of grievances experienced during the past 12 months (Question #88) could not be reported by nearly three-fifths (58.2%) of the respondents. Those who did respond to this question represented 358 (71%) of the 503 districts in the sample. Respondents in 145 (40%) of the reporting districts indicated that no formal grievances were filed during the last year. An additional 126 (33%) had three or fewer grievances. Nearly 8% of the districts (28) reported nine or more grievances filed.

Reporting on the number of impasses experienced by the district during the ten years since the Rodda Act was passed (Question #89) was somewhat better. Still,

however, more than four in ten administrators did not respond to this question. Those responding represented 407 (81%) of the districts sampled. About a quarter of these districts reported no impasses over the entire ten year period. A majority of the districts had from one to three impasses, while about 15% had four or more. Four districts reported going to impasse virtually every year.

Despite the fact that strikes are vivid and leave long lasting scars, nearly one in seven respondents did not answer the question about whether their school district had undergone a strike or other work stoppage during the last ten years (Question #90). This may be due to the rapid turnover among administrators rather than lack of organizational memory, however. Remember that nearly a quarter of all respondents have held their current job for less than two years.

Among the 467 districts reporting, nearly 70% reported no work stoppages during the last decade. An additional 22% had only one strike. Less than 2% reported experiencing three or more strikes, and none more than four.

On the question of how recently a strike was experienced (Question #91), 678 individuals from 319 districts reported no strikes had occurred. A total of 356 individuals from 131 districts reported a strikes occurring between 1965 and 1987. This leaves 53 districts (10% of the sample) unaccounted for. All respondents from these districts did not respond to this question (a total of 241 individuals did not respond).

In more than a quarter of the districts where strike years were reported respondents disagreed whether a strike had actually occurred. Where there was agreement, the largest group (26.7%) indicated that the most recent strike occurred prior to 1979. Eighteen districts reported strikes in 1985 through 1987. If the sample is representative, this would translate to between 35 and 40 strikes statewide during the last three years.

E. Non-Contractual Agreements

As shown on Table 18, respondents were also asked to indicate whether their districts have reached any form of agreement with teachers about ten topics not frequently covered by contract language. For these questions, response rates continued in the 80% to 90%

range except for the one on extra-curricular programs (not answered by about one-quarter of the sample) and the ones on career ladders and differentiated staffing (not answered by about a third of those sampled).

The questions are listed in Table 18 according to the frequency with which districts reported that they had incorporated some agreement on each topic into the teacher contract. Nearly half of all districts indicated that teacher evaluation (Question #65) is covered by the contract, an additional 20% have formal written agreements on this topic. Fewer than 10% report that the issue is treated in district policy or was never discussed.

More than a third of all districts indicated contractual agreements covering classroom observation of teachers by management (Question #68) and extra-curricular programs (Question #71). Explicit consultation with teachers on extra-curricular programs is not found in more than 40% of all districts, however. Only one district in five establishes classroom observation policies without explicit consultation with teachers.

Staff development programs (Question #64) are covered by contract in nearly a quarter of all school districts. More than 50% of all districts do not formally consult teachers on this issue, however.

Curriculum development or planning (Question #62) is covered by contracts in about one-fifth of all districts, but more than 60% of the districts do not consult formally on this issue.

About two-thirds of all districts have never discussed either career ladder programs (Question #69) or differentiated staffing arrangements (Question #70) with their teachers. Homework assignments (Question #66) and student assessment (Question #67) are primarily matters of district policy. Only about one district in ten covers any of these four topics in their labor contracts.

V. Alternative Labor Practices

Having examined the general characteristics of contemporary labor relations practice in California schools, we turn now to a closer look at the extent to which school districts across the state have developed

alternatives to the industrial union model that dominates both thinking and practice in most places.

A. Who Reported the Existence of Alternative Practices?

Questions #95 through #98 inquired into whether districts were utilizing any labor relations practices which they viewed as substantially different from typical industrial unionism. Responses to these questions are reported on Table 20. Of the 503 districts in the sample, 295 (58.6%) indicated that they definitely did not have any alternative practices (Question #95). All respondents from an additional 83 districts (16.5%) did not respond to this question, indicating that they probably are not actively engaged in any such practices. In the remaining 125 districts, 172 individuals reported that some form of alternative practice was being utilized. There was, however, disagreement about whether or not alternative practices are being utilized in 62 of the districts. All respondents (in many cases a single respondent) in the remaining 63 districts agreed that some form of alternative practice was being utilized.

Question #96 asked respondents who had indicated the use of an alternative practice to estimate how successful it had been. Only about one district in ten reported that the practice had not been at all successful. More than two-thirds viewed the alternatives as either moderately or completely successful.

Asked if the practices which they had identified would work in other districts (Question #97), more than one district in five reported that they probably or definitely would not. Nearly four-fifths reported that they probably or definitely could be used by others.

In response to the last question on the survey instrument, 165 individuals from 121 school districts provided a brief written description of the alternative practices which they felt were used in their school districts. In 71 districts with multiple respondents, not all respondents identified alternative practices and wrote descriptions. While all respondents in 50 districts wrote responses to this question, there were only 21 districts where more than one individual wrote about the presence of an alternative practice (i.e., there were at least 29 districts with single respondents who wrote a response to this question).

The next few paragraphs describe the substantive content of the 165 written descriptions of alternative practices.

B. Three Types of Alternative Practices

On close reading, the written responses to Question #98 can be seen to belong to one of three basic types (in some cases more than one type of response was given by the same individual). The most prevalent form of alternative practice described involved changes in the structure of labor relations. About two-thirds (110) of the 166 individuals who wrote responses described structural changes. Some changes involve informal meetings between teacher groups and administrators; others are much more formal, including new budget development procedures, changed bargaining team make up, and establishment of committees to handle various issues.

Among the structural innovations reported, the most common was the use of what is called "win-win" bargaining techniques. This structural change involves changing both the makeup of the bargaining teams and the timing and sequence of bargaining sessions. Thirty-five individuals reported that their districts are engaged in win-win bargaining.

Another, smaller group of respondents identified various attitude changes in their districts as indicating the presence of an alternative practice. The specific content of the reported attitude changes were about evenly divided between those who identified the existence of warm, open and high trust communication links between teachers and administrators as constituting an alternative practice, and those who talked about attitudes like mutual respect and shared interests that reflected a shift in the social status of the teacher organization within the district. Some 25 respondents reported only attitude shifts in their discussion of alternative practices. An additional 18 individuals reported both attitude and structural changes. In all, about one-fourth of all those who described the existence of an alternative practice within their district indicated that changed attitude was a major component in that practice.

This assertion that changed attitudes constitute important alternative practices in labor relations was quite surprising. Apparently the normative view of high

tension, high conflict labor relations is so well established that a significant number of educators believe that if they do not enter the labor relations process with substantial misgivings or mistrust they must be engaged in something other than ordinary industrial unionism.

VI. Opinions About Collective Bargaining

The opinions of California administrators on various aspects of labor relations were elicited by asking them to report the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with fourteen statements shown in Questions #33 to #46 of the questionnaire. Their responses are reported on Tables 7A and 7B. A score of 3.0 indicated neutral feelings about each statement. Scores above 3.0 indicated agreement, those below 3.0 indicated disagreement with the statements.

The questions are arranged on the table in the order of their mean scores for all 1,275 respondents. They are best reviewed in terms of three issues, however. The first is the impact of collective bargaining on the quality of education and public support for the schools. The second concerns the impact of bargaining on the level of trust and cooperation between teachers and administrators, and the third involves its impact on school district management.

A. Its Impact on Education

ACSA members have a relatively negative view of the overall contributions of collective bargaining to the quality of public education. They decisively disagreed with the assertion that,

> Overall, collective bargaining makes a positive contribution to education. (Question #36)

Nearly six of every ten administrators rejected this idea. This finding was certainly not surprising. In fact, we were a bit surprised to learn that a substantial number of administrators (20.9%) do believe that the overall impact of bargaining has been positive.

Another area of substantial concern among those surveyed is the impact of bargaining on public confidence in the schools. Nearly half the group (44.3%) agreed that,

> Collective bargaining has contributed greatly to a decline in public support for the schools. (Question #43)

Here again, negative feelings were not as harsh as might have been expected. More than one person in four (27%) disagreed with the view that collective bargaining has reduced public support.

B. Its Impact on Trust

The impact of collective bargaining on the level of trust between teachers and administrators in the schools is reflected in responses to two key questions. Administrators registered their strongest level of agreement with the statement,

> Trust and cooperation between individual teachers and their immediate supervisors in my school district is quite high. (Question #34)

Three quarters of the respondents reported that they agree or strongly agree with this statement. Less than 10% disagree with it.

This reported high trust between individual teachers and supervisors contrasts with a substantially lower level of agreement with the statement,

> The level of trust and cooperation between the teacher organization and the administration in my school district is quite high. (Question #33)

On this latter question (see Table 7B) less than half the respondents indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed. Actually, the distribution of responses on this item was distinctively bi-modal; relatively few administrators have neutral feelings on the issue of trust between management and the union. Although most respondents felt that trust is high, more than a third disagreed.

As described more fully below (see the Trust Syndrome section), the presence or absence of trust and cooperation between unions and school management is an extremely important component of any sound labor relations framework.

C. Impact on District Management

Ten items on the survey probed opinions about whether collective bargaining facilitates or interferes with various school management processes. Three broad dimensions are covered: feelings about what has happened to teacher organizations, appraisal of the prospects for cooperation in the school, and assessment of the effects of contracts and grievance procedures.

Three items explore administrators' views of contemporary teacher organizations. California administrators are evenly divided on whether good teachers should be expected to join and support strong teacher organizations (Question #44). The group was also rather evenly divided on the question of whether unionization has made teachers too powerful (Question #41). Despite these ambivalent feelings about the existence of strong teacher organizations, however, respondents were generally confident that,

> Teacher organizations can provide effective leadership in such areas as teacher evaluation and school program development. (Question #45)

Nearly six out of every ten administrators agreed with this statement.

Three other questions explored administrators' thoughts concerning the working relationship between managers and union members. Here the picture is quite positive. By a ratio of about seven to one, respondents agreed that:

> Generally, it is possible to develop a cooperative relationship with teacher organizations.

This confidence is probably <u>not</u> related to a belief that collective bargaining contracts are helpful in generating cooperative relationships. Fully half the respondents agreed that,

> Collective bargaining contracts undermine cooperation. (Question #37)

So, while cooperation is possible, contract negotiations are not seen as the most helpful way to secure it. We should note, however, that the reduced cooperation being reported in answers to this question may refer to those <u>among</u> managers rather than <u>between</u> managers and teachers.

A sense of the practical limitations on cooperation were also conveyed in responses to Question #38. A third of the respondents confirmed that,

> Generally, school managers are willing to involve individual teachers in program decisions, but not union representatives.

Nearly half the group rejected this idea, but the dissent on this question was much smaller than the group that felt cooperative relations are possible.

A final group of four questions explored administrators' assessments of the impact of some technical components of bargaining. Question #39 asked whether labor contracts make an important contribution to clarifying teacher rights and responsibilities. By about a five to three ratio, respondents agreed with this view. Respondents do not appear to believe, however, that this clarification should be broadened to include a wide range of working conditions because they rejected the view that restricting the scope of bargaining with teachers makes it difficult to deal with important issues (Question #36).

Grievances were the subject of the two remaining opinion items. Question #40 asked whether administrators think that grievance procedures reduce conflict by giving teachers confidence that they will be treated fairly. While more respondents agreed than disagreed with this view (43% to 34%), the response was quite mixed. There was a much stronger level of agreement with item #46 which read,

> Generally speaking, well managed school districts are able to avoid teacher grievances.

More than twice as many respondents agreed with this statement than disagreed with it (58% to 28%).

In sum, California school administrators generally do not believe that collective bargaining is making a positive contribution to education. They also believe that the level of trust and cooperation between individual teachers and their immediate supervisors is much higher than that between teacher organizations and the district administration. Despite these problems, however, there is a generally positive attitude toward teacher organizations and the bargaining process. Cooperation is believed to be possible, and teacher

organizations are thought to be capable of providing leadership in important areas.

VII. Views of Teacher Organizations

Survey respondents were asked to evaluate important aspects of the three key partners in school management and governance: the teacher organization, the management group, and the school board. This and the following two sections examine their responses to these questions.

Responses to the ten items eliciting assessments of teacher organizations are summarized in Table 4. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they agree or disagree with each item, using as a common stem:

The TEACHER ORGANIZATION in my district. . .

Two broad dimensions of each district's teacher organization were evaluated. Five items asked about the strength and overall character of the teacher organization, the other five looked at the focus and direction of its actions.

A. Teacher Organization Strength and Character

The item that elicited the strongest agreement among administrators was the one asserting that their local teacher organization

Is well organized and strong. (Question #1)

About seven in ten administrators agreed with this statement. This does not mean they like teacher organizations, of course. But it does mean that they believe that they are potent forces shaping district programs and practices.

More than 60% of all respondents agreed with two other statements about their teacher organizations: they are closely aligned with the goals of the state teacher organization (Question #6), and their leaders are dedicated and competent (Question #2). Though there was strong belief in the competency of teacher leadership, nearly one in five (18.9%) of the respondents disagreed.

On two questions administrators are less confident of the overall adequacy of teacher unions. First, there

was strong disagreement about whether the teacher organization

> Has leaders from among the best teachers. (Question #7)

Forty percent of the sample agreed that this is true, but the dissenting group was nearly as large (36.7%). A second item dividing the respondents asked whether the teacher organization

> Adequately represents all teachers. (Question #3)

Here again, disagreement was only slightly below the agreement group (35.5% to 40.2%).

B. The Focus and Direction of Action

Four items sought administrators' views regarding the nature and focus of teacher union activities. The first asserted simply that the teacher organization

> Acts responsibly. (Question #10)

Opinion was divided on this question, but agreement outpaced disagreement by a ratio of three to two.

Teacher involvement in politics was measured by two items. One asked whether they are actively involved in politics (Question #4) and the other looked at whether they publicly support school board candidates (Question #8). There is strong agreement with both of these items. Agree or strongly agree was checked more than twice as often as disagree or strongly disagree.

A final item asked whether the teacher organization

> Supports school improvement programs. (Question #5)

Generally, administrators were satisfied that teachers do support such programs. They indicated agreement with this item about three times as often as disagreement was registered.

In sum, teacher organizations are generally seen as very strong and well organized. They are viewed as staffed by dedicated and competent leaders who are closely aligned with their respective state organizations. On balance, they act responsibly,

support school improvement programs and participate actively in the political arena. Administrators are split on whether the leaders are high quality teachers or adequately truly representative of their colleagues, and they are doubtful about whether teacher unions have strong community support.

VIII. Management Self-Understanding

Table 5 summarizes responses to 11 items probing administrator views regarding how well their districts are being managed. The question format followed the same pattern as with the teacher organizations. All 11 items were preceded by a stem which read,

The MANAGEMENT of my district. . .

This stem was followed by items asking respondents to characterize the overall orientation, the effectiveness, and the level of community and board support available to district managers.

As might be expected, administrators were more positive in their views of district management than in their evaluations of either teacher organizations or school boards. Had this not been the case we would have reason to suspect that either the survey was poorly worded or many administrators are in the wrong jobs. Nevertheless, views were more positive in some areas than others, making a review of answers to these questions quite revealing.

A. Overall Management Orientation

Two items on the questionnaire illuminate the overall orientation of California school administrators to their work. Question #18 asked if individual administrators felt that the management of their district

Is committed to school improvement.

This item elicited the highest rating of all management items (90.6% agreed). Fully 58% of all respondents reported that they strongly agree and an additional 32% said that they agree with this statement. Only 3.2% of the sample indicated any level of disagreement.

The second general orientation item was question #20 which asks whether the district management

Uses an effective team management approach.

Respondents were much less confident that this is true. Only about two-thirds of the administrators responding indicated agreement with this statement, and only 25% strongly agreed that it was true.

B. Management Effectiveness

Seven items in the questionnaire explored opinions about the overall effectiveness of district management. Three of them were of a general nature and asked whether administrators agree that their district management

Is well organized and strong. (Question #11)

Is made up of competent individuals. (Question #13)

or,

Is effective in evaluating teachers. (Question #21)

Individual competence got the top rating among these three items. Nearly 85% of those surveyed agreed with this statement, and only 6% disagreed. Strength of organization was ranked second -- about three-fourths of all respondents agreed, but more than 10% did not.

Effectiveness in teacher evaluation was the lowest ranked of all the management items. Only about six administrators in ten felt that their district was doing a good job in this important area, and only two in ten were able to say they strongly agreed with this item. A fifth of the group was not sure, and about one person in seven felt that the district was not doing an effective job.

Four other items asked about management effectiveness in dealing with labor relations issues. These items asked respondents to judge whether their district management

Handles teacher contract negotiations well. (Question #14)

Handles contract administration well. (Question #15)

When necessary, deals effectively with employee performance/discipline problems. (Question #16)

or more generally,

Acts responsibly in dealing with teachers. (Question #19)

The most general item (Question #19) elicited the most agreement. More than eight out of ten administrators affirmed this much. The more specific items receives strong, but less unequivocal, support. Only about 70% agreed or strongly agreed with these three items, and more than 10% felt that their district management was not handling these matters well.

C. Community and Board Support

The last two management questions concerned support from the board and community. Administrators were much more confident of full backing from the board than of strong community support. More than seven of every ten administrators indicated the board was behind them, but only about six in ten felt that the community supported them strongly.

IX. Views of the School Board

Respondents indicated how they appraised their district school board on 11 items. These questions followed the same form used for evaluation of teacher organizations and district management. Each began with the common stem,

The SCHOOL BOARD in my district. . .

The 11 items probed three broad dimensions of school board orientations and actions. Five items asked about the political context of the board's decisionmaking activities, two items asked about their overall orientation to education, and four explored their views on labor relations issues and actions.

A. The Political Context of Board Decisionmaking

The five items assessing the political context of school board decisionmaking asked whether respondents agreed that the board:

Is cohesive in its policy views. (Question #22)

Has spirited debates with split votes. (Question #25)

Faced strong opposition in recent elections. (Question #26)

Has strong community support. (Question #29)

or,

Is made up of competent, dedicated people. (Question #23).

Personal competence and dedication was given the highest rating of these items. More than 70% of all respondents agreed that this was true. Only about one administrator in ten expressed the view that the board was not so constituted.

Broad community support was also seen as typical, with two thirds of the administrators expressing agreement and less than 10% disagreeing. On the positive side, this view was reinforced by the fact that 56.4% of the respondents indicate that board members had not faced strong electoral opposition. In more than 25% of the districts, however, strong electoral opposition was being experienced. Apparently strong opposition is not always equated with a loss of community support.

The two items regarding actual decisionmaking activities elicited somewhat divergent responses. Half the respondents agreed that spirited debates and split votes occur in their districts; only 30% disagreed, while about 20% were not sure. At the same time, however, almost 60% reported that their boards were cohesive in their policy views. Apparently a significant number of administrators do not believe that spirited debates and split votes detract from an overall cohesiveness in board policy views. It is a bit hard to say why administrators would feel this way -- the research literature on this topic asserts unequivocally that boards strive for public unanimity, and record split votes only when their policy views are seriously divided.

B. The Boards' General Orientation to Education

Two items covered the boards' general orientation to education. The first, Question #28, asked whether administrators believe their boards support school improvement programs. Overwhelmingly, boards are seen as supportive. Only about 2% of the administrators surveyed dissented from this view of their school board's orientation.

The second general orientation question asked whether boards are more concerned about quality than cost. Here administrator reports are not nearly as glowing. Only 45.4% of the respondents expressed agreement with this item, less than 15% indicating strong agreement. Fully a quarter of all respondents felt that board members were not more concerned with quality than cost.

C. Board Views on Labor Relations Issues and Actions

Specific labor relations issues were covered in four items. Two items asked for an evaluation of the board's overall stance by inquiring whether the board

> Accepts as legitimate the rights of teachers to organize and bargain collectively. (Question #32)
>
> or,
>
> Believes that, on balance, unionization of teachers has been a good thing. (Question #27)

There was strong agreement that boards accept the legitimacy of teacher unionization. Agreement was reported eight times more frequently than disagreement (69% to 8%). On the question of its benefits, the view is decidedly less sanguine. By a two to one margin, administrators who offered an assessment indicated that boards do not see collective bargaining as beneficial.

Two other items asked about the actions which school boards take in the labor relations arena. One item, Question #30, asked whether boards have taken tough bargaining stances. While a third of the administrators did not venture an opinion on this question, those who did indicated by a three to one margin that board toughness is the rule.

The other action item asked whether administrators felt that their boards act responsibly on labor issues (Question #24). Toughness notwithstanding, boards were seen as reasonable about five times out of six.

In sum, school boards are seen by administrators as personally dedicated and competent. They accept the legitimacy of teacher unionization, but are not at all enthusiastic about its value for education. They are seen as being able to take a tough, but responsible, bargaining position. And they are seen as having a solid interest in school improvement. Board support by the community is seen as high, though strong electoral opposition was encountered in about a quarter of all elections. Curiously, the surveyed administrators felt that spirited policy debates and splits votes are the norm, while they also believe that their boards have cohesive policy views.

X. Looking for Patterns in Administrator Views

Thus far, we have been looking at the responses of administrators to individual questions on the survey. In the next section we begin using more sophisticated statistical techniques to identify overall patterns within the data. While the patterns explored can help shed light on the origins of various labor relations problems, and can point to possible methods of alleviating those problems, we must stress that multivariate statistics is no substitute for common sense. The patterns identified through complex data analysis techniques need to be tested against practical experience in the day to day practice of education.

With this caveat in mind, it has been truly exciting to explore this body of data. It is almost embarrassingly rich in strong patterns of correlation among variables, correlations that suggest strong connections between particular labor relations problems and practices and the development of particular attitudes and beliefs among educational leaders.

Much more can be learned from the data than will be found in this report. Administrators responding to this survey were asked to provide us with their California County-District-School codes so that we could link their labor relations experiences and opinions to other available data sets (such as the student achievement data produced by the California Assessment Program (CAP) or the district and staff demographics generated through the California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS).

Work on the data will continue in coming months, and reports of findings circulated to the ACSA membership.

The first, and by far the largest, response pattern in the data is embodied in what we have come to call the "trust syndrome." The reason for this name will become clear as the results of some multivariate analyses of key questions is developed.

XI. The Trust Syndrome

As noted earlier (see Section VI.B, page 17), ACSA members are sharply divided in their assessments of the overall level of trust and cooperation between teacher organizations and school management. Hence, this item (Question #33) provides a natural place to begin our search for meaningful patterns in labor relations views and experiences. What are the origins of these vivid experiences of trust or mistrust in local districts? Are they rooted in objective labor relations problems such as grievances, negotiating impasses, strikes, etc.? Or are they connected to feelings administrators have about the quality and character of the teachers organization, school management system, or the school board in their districts? Or are they possibly the natural outgrowth of such personal background and experience factors as age, gender, education, job, or direct experience with labor relations?

A. Trust and Objective Labor Relations Problems

As shown in Table 21, seven objective indicators of labor relations problems covered in this survey are very closely tied to the issue of trust and cooperation. There are two ways to look at the relationships among these responses. The first is to take the labor relations problems one by one and see if they are closely related to the question of trust. These relationships are shown in the so-called "zero-order correlations" shown in column two of Table 21. The strongest zero-order correlation (-.358) is with the number of formal grievances experienced during the last twelve months (Question #88). The negative sign means that as the number of grievances goes up, the level of trust and cooperation reported tends to go down. All of the other indicators on the table follow this same pattern, except for the number of multi-year contracts negotiated during the ten year history of the Rodda Act.

That is, the level of trust and cooperation is eroded where:

- contract negotiations are more tense and not yet settled (Question #87),
- the number of impasses declared over the last ten years is high (Question #89),
- there has been one or strikes or other work stoppages (Question #90),
- the latest strike occurred recently (Question #91), and/or
- the number of days lost due to work stoppages is relatively large (Question #92).

There is nothing particularly surprising about these relationships. These experiences are frequently cited when administrators discuss their reasons for not liking or trusting the collective bargaining process. It may be important to note that the number of formal grievances filed is a better predictor of weakened trust than either strikes or impasses. Hence, while the trauma of real or threatened work stoppage is often seen by the public as the most powerful indicator of bad relationships between administrators and teachers, administrators themselves find grievances more destructive to the working relationship.

The relationship between high trust and the negotiation of multi-year contracts is quite weak (the correlation is only .049). Nevertheless, the relationship is in the expected direction -- multi-year teacher contracts do increase slightly the chances that trust and cooperation will flourish.

A second way of looking at the relationship between the objective indicators of labor relations problems and the reported level of trust and cooperation is to apply multiple regression analysis to the entire set of answers. The results of this analysis are also shown on Table 21.

The multiple R-squared of .23, reported near the top of the table indicates that, taken together, the labor relations problems listed in this table account for 23% of the variation in the responses to the trust and cooperation question. Put simply, this means that

if we know the number of grievances, the current status of negotiations, and the other labor relations conditions listed in the table, we can predict within a 23% spread (i.e., plus or minus half a point on the scale used) what level of trust and cooperation will be reported in any school district.

As the entries in the last column of the table indicate, we only need to know about four of the seven labor relations indicators to make our prediction of the level of trust. The size of the regression coefficients entered in this column is a measure of just how much the trust and cooperation response is affected by each of these conditions. Thus, for example, for every two grievances filed (answers to Question #88 were scored in increments of two grievances), the level of trust and cooperation falls an average of three-tenths of a point.

The use of multiple regression analysis to interpret this data adds two important elements to our understanding of the relationship between trust and labor relations problems. First, it shows that all of the various labor problems tend to occur in the same time and place. That is why the number of strikes, the timing of the most recent strike and the number of days lost to work stoppages are significantly related to trust when viewed alone, but are not needed by the regression equation. The variables that predict increases or decreases in the level of trust also predict the probability of strikes occurring in a district.

The second important lesson to be drawn from the regression is that the number of multi-year contracts, which was not significantly related to trust by itself, plays a quite important role when it occurs in combination with reduced grievances, impasses and early contract settlements. On average, the level of trust rises a tenth of a point for every multi-year contract settled, when the incidence of other labor problems is low.

B. Trust and Views of the Teacher Organization

The relationships between responses to the trust and cooperation item (Question #33) and respondents views of the teacher organization in their district are displayed in Table 22. Once again, we find a very strong relationship between administrators' responses to the teacher organization section of the questionnaire and their assessment of the level of trust and

cooperation between management and the teacher organization. As indicated in the "zero-order correlation" column, Question #10, asking whether the teacher organization "Acts responsibly" is the best predictor of trust. The correlation is positive, indicating that trust goes up as the perception that the teacher organization is acting responsibly goes up.

While the strong relationship between trust and responsible action on the part of the teacher organization is not surprising, it was interesting to see little or no relationship between the level of trust and cooperation and administrator reports that their teacher organization was either closely aligned with the goals of their state organization (Question #6) or involved in publicly supporting school board candidates (Question #8).

The multiple regression results reported on Table 22 indicate that the five teacher organization items at the top of the table can be used to very substantially predict the level of trust that will be found in a school district. A one point increase in reported responsible action leads to nearly four tenths of a point increase in the trust level. Increasing confidence that teacher leaders are drawn from the best teachers and that they are adequately representative of all teachers also add measurably to the trust level. If unions are seen as supporting school improvement programs, perceived trust and cooperation go up significantly. By contrast, where local unions are seen as active in politics (but not by supporting board candidates) trust is eroded.

C. Trust and Views of District Management

How survey respondents viewed the management of their own school district was even more closely linked to their feelings about the level of trust and cooperation with teachers. As shown in Table 23, every one of the eleven management evaluation items is strongly linked to the perceived level of trust. The strongest predictor, with a zero-order correlation of .465 was whether or not the district management was seen as handling contract negotiations well. The weakest predictor, which was still quite substantial, was whether the management was seen as having the full backing of the school board.

The multiple regression results shown in the last column of the table indicate that the various management

appraisals are so closely linked that just four items yield the strongest prediction equation. Three of the four key predictors are matters over which managers have a great deal of control. Trust and cooperation were seen as going up sharply when

- contract negotiations are handled well,
- an effective team approach is taken to management, and
- district management is effective in evaluating teachers.

The fourth key predictor was whether or not management has strong community support. This item confirms earlier research indicating that teachers are successful in forcing changes on reluctant managers only if they secure a strong base of community support.

D. Trust and Views of the School Board

Table 24 analyzes the relationship between trust and cooperation and survey respondent views of their local school boards. Once again, we find very strong zero-order correlations between most of the individual board assessment items and the responses to Question #33. The strongest link is with the perception that the board is acting responsibly on labor relations issues (zero-order correlation of .318). Strong linkages also exist between a board concern with quality rather than cost, and with broad based community support for the board. As might be expected, as boards are perceived to believe more strongly that unionization has been a good thing, the perceived level of trust and cooperation goes up.

The results of the multiple regression analysis shown in the last column of Table 24 contain a couple of interesting surprises. First, there are two factors which did not initially appear to be closely related to trust that interact with the other items to produce a significant impact. Where boards take a tough bargaining stance, trust and cooperation are seen as lower. And, where school boards have been facing strong opposition in recent elections, trust is significantly lower.

The second surprise in the multivariate analysis is that board competence and policy cohesiveness do not add to the ability of other items to predict the level of

trust and cooperation. Trust levels appear to be primarily linked to the way the boards deal with labor issues themselves, not with their overall capacity for sound judgement and policy formation.

E. A Syndrome, not a Causal Analysis

The linkage between objective labor relations problems, the level of trust and cooperation between management and the teacher organization, and the character and activity of teacher organizations, management groups and school boards described in the previous sections are extraordinarily strong. By the standards of ordinary social science research, they constitute an absolutely unequivocal finding. We can, without the slightest hesitation, say trust is directly linked to identifiable labor relations problems and practices and that it is even more strongly linked to perceptions of teacher organization responsibility, effective managerial actions and sensitive responsible action by school boards.

Despite its strength, however, finding this pattern of relationships among a large cluster of variables leaves unanswered some key questions. Our survey data simply do not tell us which of the key variables comes first. Does trust come first, leading to sensitive and constructive actions by all the parties, which in turn leads to a reduction in labor tension and strife? Or is it that the legal creation of grievance and impasse mechanisms encourages their use and this erodes trust and poisons perceptions of board, management and teacher organizations? Or is it that real weaknesses in managerial effectiveness, board sensitivity or teacher organization leadership causes trust to decline which in turn encourages grievances and conflict oriented bargaining relationships?

Survey data of the type collected in this project simply are not appropriate for trying to sort out the sequence of causal linkages among these critical variables. What we can say, however, is that there is a Trust Syndrome in public school labor relations. When trust is high, grievances and other labor relations problems are reduced and all of the key players are seen as behaving more responsibly and effectively. What school administrators need is a systematic program for testing alternative ways of alleviating the mistrust and creating this positive trust syndrome. Strategies that reduce the incidence of objective problems should be developed along with new management strategies for

improving trust and cooperation directly. At the same time, careful attention needs to be given to the specific contributions of management and school board policies to the climate of trust.

XII. Conclusion

This report has only scratched the surface of the data collected in this survey. The overall status of labor relations in California schools has been reviewed. The way administrators feel about basic collective bargaining issues has been described, and their views of teacher organizations, school management and school boards described.

The data demonstrate that administrators are broadly experienced with the basic elements of labor relations -- proposal development, negotiations, contract administration and grievance resolution. We found, however, a certain amount of confusion about important aspects of the bargaining process. The legal concept of "confidential employee" is clearly not understood by many administrators. There was considerable confusion over exactly who is the chief management spokesperson when it comes to teacher negotiations. And there were significant gaps in many administrators' knowledge about the history of negotiations and the content of contracts.

We found that administrators are less troubled by collective bargaining than many would have expected. While not enthusiastic about the contributions of bargaining to education, administrators do feel that cooperation is possible. They even expect that teacher organizations can be expected to provide significant leadership in schools.

We found a great variety in the frequency with which various topics are negotiated, and that many districts incorporate into district policy or informal agreements with teachers matters which others place in the contract.

Finally, we began the process of examining inter-relationships among the responses to the survey. The only set of those relationships covered in this report is the "Trust Syndrome" that links the incidence of objective labor relations problems, like grievances and impasses, to the general level of trust and cooperation

between teacher organizations and, in turn, to the assessments of the character and actions of teacher organizations, boards and administrators.

ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

LABOR RELATIONS SURVEY

In cooperation with the Far West Laboratory, ACSA is undertaking a comprehensive study of labor relations in California public schools. The purpose of the study is to discover what might be done to improve current practice in this vitally important area.

You have been selected as part of a carefully drawn sample of the ACSA membership. We would like to know about conditions in your school district, and to have your views on a number of basic labor relations issues. Since we are taking only a sample, rather than asking everyone in the Association to fill out a questionnaire, every response counts. Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelop directly to our Burlingame office:

Association of California School Administrators
1575 Old Bayshore Highway
Burlingame, CA 94010

Your responses will be held in strictest confidence. No individual data will be released to anyone. Please begin by recording below the California CDS code for your district and, if you are located at a school site, your school (the CDS code is the one found in the Public School Directory, and used on CBEDS and CAP reports). These codes enable us to link survey responses to collective bargaining cost data and other indicators available from the State Department of Education.

To report your code, write the digits in the spaces at the left, and also circle the corresponding digits in the list printed to the right.

The two digit county code is:

____ 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 0
____ 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 0

The five digit district code is:

____ 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 0
____ 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 0
____ 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 0
____ 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 0
____ 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 0

The seven digit school code is:

____ 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 0
____ 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 0
____ 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 0
____ 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 0
____ 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 0
____ 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 0
____ 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 0

Please circle a number at the right to indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements below, as follows:

[1] Strongly Disagree. [2] Disagree Somewhat. [3] Neither Agree nor Disagree. [4] Agree Somewhat. [5] Strongly Agree.

		Disagree<----->Agree
The **TEACHER ORGANIZATION** in my district...		
1. Is well organized and strong.	1:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
2. Has dedicated competent leaders.	2:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
3. Adequately represents all teachers.	3:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
4. Is actively involved in politics.	4:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
5. Supports school improvement programs.	5:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
6. Is closely aligned to the goals of the state teacher organization.	6:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
7. Has leaders from among the best teachers.	7:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
8. Publicly supports School Board candidates.	8:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
9. Has strong community support.	9:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
10. Acts responsibly.	10:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
The **MANAGEMENT** of my district...		
11. Is well organized and strong.	11:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
12. Has strong community support.	12:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
13. Is made up of competent individuals.	13:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
14. Handles teacher contract negotiations well.	14:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
15. Handles contract administration well.	15:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
16. When necessary, deals effectively with employee performance/discipline problems.	16:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
17. Has full backing from the School Board.	17:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
18. Is committed to school improvement.	18:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
19. Acts responsibly in dealing with teachers.	19:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
20. Uses an effective team management approach.	20:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
21. Is effective in evaluating teachers.	21:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
The **SCHOOL BOARD** in my district...		
22. Is cohesive in its policy views.	22:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
23. Is made up of competent, dedicated people.	23:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
24. Acts responsibly on labor relations issues.	24:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
25. Has spirited debates with split votes.	25:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
26. Faced strong opposition in recent elections.	26:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
27. Believes that, on balance, unionization of teachers has been a good thing.	27:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
28. Supports school improvement programs.	28:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
29. Has broad community support.	29:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
30. Takes a tough collective bargaining stance.	30:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
31. Is more concerned about quality than cost.	31:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
32. Accepts as legitimate the rights of teachers to organize and bargain collectively.	32:	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

Please circle a number at the right to indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements below, as follows:

[1] Strongly Disagree. [2] Disagree Somewhat. [3] Neither Agree nor Disagree. [4] Agree Somewhat. [5] Strongly Agree.

	Disagree<----->Agree
33. The level of trust and cooperation between the teacher organization and the administration in my school district is quite high.	33: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
34. Trust and cooperation between individual teachers and their immediate supervisors in my school district is quite high.	34: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
35. Overall, collective bargaining makes a positive contribution to education.	35: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
36. Restricting the scope of bargaining with teachers makes it difficult to deal with important issues.	36: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
37. Collective bargaining contracts undermine cooperation.	37: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
38. Generally, school managers are willing to involve individual teachers in program decisions, but not union representatives.	38: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
39. Labor contracts make an important contribution to clarifying teacher rights and responsibilities.	39: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
40. Grievance procedures reduce conflict by giving teachers confidence they will be treated fairly.	40: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
41. Unionization has made teachers too powerful.	41: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
42. Generally, it is possible to develop a cooperative relationship with teacher organizations.	42: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
43. Collective bargaining has contributed greatly to a decline in public support for the schools.	43: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
44. High quality teachers should be expected to join and support a strong organization.	44: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
45. Teacher organizations can provide effective leadership in such areas as teacher evaluation and school program development.	45: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
46. Generally speaking, well managed school districts are able to avoid teacher grievances.	46: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

If negotiated in your district, how difficult was it to reach agreement on the topics listed below? Indicate your responses by circling a number at the right, as follows:

[0] Topic not negotiated.
[1] Proposed, but dropped during negotiations.
[2] Agreement reached easily.
[3] Required serious negotiation.
[4] Settled with great difficulty.
[5] Was issue in impasse or strike.
[6] I don't know.

47. Class size.	47:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6
48. Assignment/transfer of teachers.	48:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6
49. Basic teacher salaries.	49:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6
50. Fringe benefit package.	50:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6
51. Extra duty assignments.	51:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6
52. Extra duty compensation.	52:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6
53. Staffing ratios for specialists.	53:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6
54. Merit or performance pay plans.	54:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6
55. Mentor Teacher program.	55:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6
56. Teacher evaluation plan.	56:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6
57. Staff development plans.	57:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6
58. Teacher discipline procedures.	58:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6
59. Teacher preparation time.	59:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6
60. Use of lottery funds.	60:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6
61. Length of school day/year.	61:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6

Has your district reached any agreements with teachers on any of the following topics? Circle a number to indicate your response, as follows:

[0] Subject never discussed.
[1] Covered by District policy, not discussed with teacher organization.
[2] Subject covered in contract.
[3] Informal agreement, not in writing.
[4] Formal agreement in writing.
[5] Don't know, not sure.

62. Curriculum development or planning.	62:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
63. Student discipline.	63:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
64. Staff development programs.	64:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
65. Teacher evaluation.	65:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
66. Homework assignments.	66:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
67. Student assessment.	67:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
68. Classroom observation by management.	68:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
69. Career ladder program.	69:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
70. Differentiated staffing arrangements.	70:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
71. Extra-curricular programs.	71:	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

Please describe yourself by circling the appropriate responses to each of the questions below. (circle all that apply)

72. Do you work in a district office?

1. No.
2. Yes, as Supt. or Asst. Supt.
3. Yes, as Business Mgr. or Controller.
4. Yes, as Dst. Personnel Officer.
5. Yes, as Supervisor or Coordinator.
6. Yes, in another staff position.

73. Do you work at a school site?

1. No.
2. Yes, as Principal or Asst. Principal.
3. Yes, as Vice Principal or Dean.
4. Yes, as Department Chair.
5. Yes, as Program Specialist.
6. Yes, in another staff position.

74. Are you a identified as a confidential employee? 1. No. 2. Yes.

75. If at a school site, is your school:

1. Elementary
2. Jr. High/Middle.
3. High School.
4. Other/Special.
5. I don't work at a school site.

76. How long have you held your current job?

1. Less than 2 yrs.
2. 2 or 3 years.
3. 4 or 5 years.
4. 6 or 7 yrs.
5. 8 or 9 yrs.
6. 10 or more yrs.

77. What is your gender? 1. Male 2. Female

78. What is your age group?

1. Under 30.
2. 30 to 34.
3. 35 to 39.
4. 40 to 44.
5. 45 to 49.
6. 50 to 54.
7. 55 to 59.
8. 60 to 64.
9. 65 or Older.

79. What is your highest educational degree?

1. BA/BS. 2. MA/MS. 3. Ph D/Ed D. 4. Other Degree_____.

80. Have you been employed by a district at the time of a teacher strike or other work stoppage?

1. No. 2. Yes, as a teacher. 3. Yes, as a manager or supervisor.
4. Yes, as confidential employee. 5. Yes, other _____.

81. Have you personally assisted in the preparation of negotiation proposals?

1. No. 2. Yes, for management. 3. Yes, for teachers. 4. Yes, for both.

82. Have you personally served as a member of a negotiating team?

1. No. 2. Yes, for management. 3. Yes, for teachers. 4. Yes, for both.

83. Have you personally been the object of a teacher grievance? 1. No. 2. Yes.

84. What union is the exclusive representative for teachers in your district?

1. California Teachers Association. (CTA/NEA).
2. California Federation of Teachers. (CFT/AFT).
3. United Teachers of Los Angeles (UTLA).
4. Another union _____ _____.
5. No union.

85. How does the average teacher salary in your district compare with districts of similar size and type?

1. Much lower.
2. Somewhat Lower.
3. About the same.
4. Somewhat Higher.
5. Much Higher.
6. I'm not sure.

86. How would you rate you district's financial condition?

1. Comfortable.
2. Sound.
3. Adequate.
4. Tight.
5. Troubled.
6. I'm not sure.

87. What is the present status of labor negotiations in your district?

1. Contract settled; routine negotiations.
2. Contract settled; tense negotiations.
3. Now engaged in routine negotiations.
4. Now engaged in intense negotiations.
5. Currently at impasse.
6. Strike or work stoppage underway.

88. How many formal grievances have been filed by teachers in your district during the past 12 months? (circle actual number)

0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 or more. 99. I don't know.

89. How many times has your district declared impasse in teacher negotiations during the 10 years since the Rodda Act was passed? (circle actual number)

0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 or more. 99. I don't know.

90. How many teacher strikes or other work stoppages has your district experienced during the 10 years since the Rodda Act was passed?

0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 or more. 99. I don't know.

91. In what year was the most recent strike or work stoppage?

_____ year. 0. No strikes. 99. I don't know.

92. What would you estimate to be the <u>total number of working days lost by a single teacher</u> participating in all strikes or other work stoppages in your district during the 10 years since the Rodda Act was passed?

_____ days. 0. No strikes. 99. I don't know.

93. How many times has your district negotiated multi-year teacher contracts during the 10 years since the Rodda Act was passed?

0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 9. I don't know.

94. Who is the chief spokesperson for management during teacher contract negotiations?

1. The superintendent.
2. The district personnel officer.
3. Another full time dst. employee.
4. A board member.
5. An outside consultant or lawyer.
6. Other _____

95. Has your district tried any labor relations practices which you view as significantly different from typical industrial unionism?

1. No. 2. Yes. 3. Don't know/no opinion.

96. If you answered yes to question 95, how successful do you feel that these practices have been in your district?

1. Not at all.
2. Somewhat.
3. Moderately.
4. Completely.
0. None tried.
9. Don't know/no opinion.

97. If you answered yes to question 95, do you think these practices could work successfully in many other school districts?

1. No, definitely not.
2. Probably not.
3. Yes, probably.
4. Yes, definitely.
0. None tried.
9. Don't know/no opinion.

98. If you answered yes to question 95, would you describe in a sentence or two what practices you have in mind? (use back of page if needed)

Thank you for your cooperation -- Watch <u>THRUST</u> magazine for survey results

Please return immediately to ACSA office at address shown on page 1.

APPENDIX B: TABLES

Table 1. County Distribution of Membership and Responses

Table 1. ACSA Membership and Survey Response Rate by County

County Code No.	ACSA Mbrs. in County	Sample Size	% Mbrs in Sample
1	621	62	.10
2	2	0	0
3	18	3	.17
4	114	14	.12
5	27	3	.11
6	20	4	.20
7	376	35	.09
8	14	3	.21
9	90	10	.11
10	483	36	.07
11	32	2	.06
12	86	12	.14
13	102	8	.08
14	16	3	.19
15	336	40	.12
16	82	16	.20
17	31	8	.26
18	29	7	.24
19	2593	224	.09
20	68	6	.09
21	111	13	.12
22	15	2	.13
23	67	5	.07
24	139	10	.07
25	14	2	.14
26	12	3	.25
27	175	18	.10
28	43	5	.12
29	38	5	.13
30	800	65	.08
31	104	14	.13
32	18	2	.11
33	435	38	.09
34	501	50	.10
35	36	3	.08
36	634	72	.11
37	805	73	.09
38	36	4	.11
39	271	27	.10
40	103	11	.11
41	283	31	.11
42	159	19	.12
43	680	68	.10
44	114	12	.11
45	116	13	.11
46	4	1	.25
47	45	6	.13
48	189	20	.11
49	195	23	.12
50	191	18	.09
51	44	9	.20
52	42	4	.10
53	22	1	.05
54	206	21	.10
55	39	5	.13
56	391	42	.11
57	61	6	.10
58	49	7	.14
Total:	12,327	1,224	.12

Table 2. ACSA Membership and Sample
Response Rate by Gender by Job Title

	Males			Females		
	Mbrs	Smpl	%	Mbrs	Smpl	%
Supt, Asst Supt.	1078	207	19.2	178	38	21.3
Bus Mgr/Controller	91	3	3.3	73	6	8.2
Personnel Officer	172	38	22.1	115	17	14.8
Supervisor/Coord.	340	76	22.4	269	81	30.1
Principal/Asst Prin.	3780	444	11.7	2116	179	8.5
Vice Prin/Dean	610	52	8.5	383	31	8.1

Table 3. ACSA Membership and Sample
Response Rate by Confidential Employee Status

	Males			Females		
	Mbrs	Smpl	%	Mbrs	Smpl	%
Reported Status as Confidential Employees	8	342	4,275.0	418	167	40.0

THE FOLLOWING TABLES

PRESENT

THE RESPONSES OF ALL INDIVIDUALS

TO EACH QUESTION

IN THE

ACSA LABOR RELATIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

Responses are shown in percentages. The *'s shown to the right of the response percentages represent a crude bar-graph. Each * represents about 10% of the sample. A total of 1,275 completed questionnaires are reported in these tables.

For some items the overall mean score for all respondents is shown in the last column of the table. For some items the total responses for various sub-groups are shown to the left of the various response labels.

Table 4. Views of Teacher Organizations
Frequency of Response for Individuals

THE TEACHER ORGANIZATION. . .			PERCENT		MEAN
		Disagree	2.1		
	15.7		13.6	*	
1. Is well organized & strong.		Neutral	14.3	*	3.82
	69.9		39.8	****	
		Agree	30.1	***	
		Disagree	1.9		
	8.0		6.1	*	
6. Is aligned with state organization.		Neutral	30.3	***	3.78
	61.7		35.7	****	
		Agree	26.0	***	
		Disagree	4.0		
	18.9		14.9	*	
2. Has dedicated & competent leaders.		Neutral	19.4	**	3.60
	61.6		40.1	****	
		Agree	21.5	**	
		Disagree	5.1	*	
	20.8		15.7	**	
4. Is actively involved in politics.		Neutral	23.1	**	3.54
	56.0		32.0	***	
		Agree	24.0	**	
		Disagree	3.4		
	17.5		14.1	*	
5. Supports improvement programs.		Neutral	26.6	***	3.53
	55.9		37.6	****	
		Agree	18.3	**	
		Disagree	10.7	*	
	22.9		12.2	*	
8. Supports board candidates.		Neutral	23.0	**	3.50
	54.0		24.3	**	
		Agree	29.7	***	
		Disagree	7.5	*	
	30.6		23.1	**	
10. Acts responsibly.		Neutral	24.2	**	3.18
	45.3		35.0	****	
		Agree	10.3	*	
		Disagree	11.0	*	
	35.5		24.5	**	
3. Represents all teachers.		Neutral	24.3	**	3.05
	40.2		28.9	***	
		Agree	11.3	*	
		Disagree	12.4	*	
	36.7		24.3	**	
7. Has Leaders among best teachers.		Neutral	22.5	**	3.04
	40.7		28.6	***	
		Agree	12.1	*	
		Disagree	9.3	*	
	40.1		30.8	***	
9. Has strong community support.		Neutral	40.0	****	2.74
	19.9		16.3	**	
		Agree	3.6		

Table 5. Views of District Management
Frequency of Response for Individuals

THE MANAGEMENT . . .		PERCENT		MEAN
18. Is committed to school improvement.	Disagree 3.2	.4		4.45
	Neutral 6.2	2.8	*	
	Agree 90.6	32.6	***	
		58.0	******	
13. Consists of competent individuals.	Disagree 6.0	1.1		4.18
	Neutral 9.1	4.9	*	
	Agree 84.9	44.7	****	
		40.2	****	
19. Acts responsibly with teachers.	Disagree 4.9	.6		4.17
	Neutral 12.1	4.3	*	
	Agree 82.9	43.5	****	
		39.4	****	
17. Has full backing of school board.	Disagree 13.5	2.9		3.96
	Neutral 13.9	10.6	*	
	Agree 72.7	33.6	***	
		39.1	****	
11. Is well organized & strong.	Disagree 11.1	2.9		3.93
	Neutral 14.3	8.2	*	
	Agree 74.6	41.8	****	
		32.8	***	
14. Handles negotiations well.	Disagree 12.7	2.7		3.90
	Neutral 15.9	10.0	*	
	Agree 71.4	37.9	****	
		33.5	***	
15. Handles contract admin. well.	Disagree 11.2	3.1		3.87
	Neutral 17.3	8.1	*	
	Agree 71.5	41.8	****	
		29.7	***	
16. Has effective employee discipline.	Disagree 14.4	3.1		3.73
	Neutral 18.2	11.3	*	
	Agree 67.5	44.7	****	
		22.8	**	
20. Uses effective team management.	Disagree 16.4	4.3		3.70
	Neutral 19.5	12.1	*	
	Agree 65.1	39.6	****	
		25.5	***	
12. Has strong community support.	Disagree 10.7	1.7		3.68
	Neutral 26.1	9.0	*	
	Agree 63.2	45.9	*****	
		17.3	**	
21. Effectively evaluates teachers.	Disagree 14.6	2.8		3.63
	Neutral 22.7	11.8	*	
	Agree 62.8	45.0	*****	
		17.8	**	

Table 6. Views of Local School Boards
Frequency of Response for Individuals

THE SCHOOL BOARD. . .		PERCENT	MEAN
28. Supports school improvement pgms.	Disagree 2.1	.4	4.44
		1.7	
	Neutral 91.2	6.8 *	
		35.8 ****	
	Agree	55.4 ******	
23. Has competent dedicated people.	Disagree 13.6	2.4	3.90
		11.2 *	
	Neutral 70.8	15.5 **	
		35.9 ****	
	Agree	34.9 ***	
32. Accepts teachers' right to bargain.	Disagree 8.0	1.4	3.85
		6.6 *	
	Neutral 69.1	23.0 **	
		43.7 ****	
	Agree	25.4 ***	
29. Has broad community support.	Disagree 9.8	1.9	3.80
		7.9 *	
	Neutral 66.0	24.3 **	
		40.3 ****	
	Agree	25.7 ***	
24. Acts responsibly on labor issues.	Disagree 13.7	2.1	3.79
		11.6 *	
	Neutral 67.1	19.1 **	
		39.8 ****	
	Agree	27.3 ***	
22. Is cohesive in policy views.	Disagree 22.6	5.6 *	3.54
		17.0 **	
	Neutral 58.5	18.9 **	
		34.8 ***	
	Agree	23.7 **	
30. Takes tough bargaining stance.	Disagree 18.7	5.2 *	3.39
		13.5 *	
	Neutral 48.9	32.4 ***	
		34.5 ***	
	Agree	14.4 *	
31. Is concerned with quality over cost.	Disagree 25.3	6.3 *	3.28
		19.0 **	
	Neutral 45.4	29.3 ***	
		31.7 ***	
	Agree	13.7 *	
25. Has spirited debates/split votes.	Disagree 30.7	12.2 *	3.27
		18.5 **	
	Neutral 50.4	19.0 **	
		30.6 ***	
	Agree	19.8 **	
27. Believes unionization is good.	Disagree 38.6	14.1 *	2.70
		24.5 **	
	Neutral 18.7	42.7 ****	
		14.2 *	
	Agree	4.5	
26. Faced strong electoral opposition.	Disagree 56.4	31.8 ***	2.46
		24.6 **	
	Neutral 25.5	18.0 **	
		16.6 **	
	Agree	8.9 *	

Table 7A. Opinions on Labor Relations Issues
Frequency of Response for Individuals

LABOR RELATIONS OPINIONS . . .			PERCENT	MEAN
		Disagree	1.8	
	9.6		7.8 *	
34. High teacher/supervisor trust.		Neutral	15.0 **	3.85
	75.4		54.5 *****	
		Agree	20.9 **	
		Disagree	2.5	
	11.5		9.0 *	
42. Cooperative relations possible.		Neutral	16.6 **	3.78
	71.9		52.0 *****	
		Agree	19.9 **	
		Disagree	8.8 *	
	28.1		19.3 **	
46. Well-managed means few grievances.		Neutral	13.6 *	3.44
	58.2		36.1 ****	
		Agree	22.1 **	
		Disagree	12.5 *	
	26.7		14.2 *	
45. Tchr Orgs can provide leadership.		Neutral	14.6 *	3.40
	58.6		38.2 ****	
		Agree	20.4 **	
		Disagree	9.5 *	
	31.5		22.0 **	
37. Contracts undermine cooperation.		Neutral	18.8 **	3.27
	49.7		31.2 ***	
		Agree	18.5 **	
		Disagree	10.3 *	
	28.2		17.9 **	
39. Contracts clarify rights/respons.		Neutral	20.5 **	3.26
	51.3		38.1 ****	
		Agree	13.2 *	
		Disagree	7.8 *	
	27.0		19.2 **	
43. Leads to decline in public supp.		Neutral	28.6 ***	3.24
	44.3		29.5 ***	
		Agree	14.8 *	

Table 7B. Views of Labor Relations Issues
Frequency of Response for Individuals

LABOR RELATIONS OPINIONS . . .			PERCENT	MEAN
		Disagree	12.7 *	
	36.1		23.4 **	
33. High union/management trust.		Neutral	16.8 **	3.11
	46.9		33.8 ***	
		Agree	13.1 *	
		Disagree	12.0 *	
	34.3		22.3 **	
40. Grievance proc. reduces conflict.		Neutral	22.3 **	3.06
	43.4		34.4 ***	
		Agree	9.0 *	
		Disagree	11.1 *	
	38.8		27.7 ***	
41. Teachers are too powerful.		Neutral	28.2 ***	2.95
	33.0		21.2 **	
		Agree	11.8 *	
		Disagree	21.7 **	
	37.6		15.9 **	
44. Expect teachers to join unions.		Neutral	25.8 ***	2.91
	36.6		23.6 **	
		Agree	13.0 *	
		Disagree	21.0 **	
	45.7		24.7 **	
38. Managers ask tchrs, not unions.		Neutral	21.0 **	2.79
	33.3		20.9 **	
		Agree	12.4 *	
		Disagree	22.1 **	
	44.3		22.2 **	
36. Restricting scope makes problems.		Neutral	29.1 ***	2.70
	27.6		18.3 **	
		Agree	9.3 *	
		Disagree	31.2 ***	
	56.9		25.7 ***	
35. Collective bargaining is positive.		Neutral	22.3 **	2.37
	20.9		16.4 **	
		Agree	4.5	

Table 8A. Topics of Frequent Negotiation
Frequency of Response for Individuals

CONTRACT CLAUSE			PERCENT	
49. Basic teacher salaries.	.4	Not Negot.	.3	
		Dropped	.1	
	99.7	Easy Agree.	13.4	*
		Agreement	36.5	****
		Hard Agree.	25.7	***
		Impas/Strk.	24.1	**
50. Fringe benefit package.	1.5	Not Negot.	1.1	
		Dropped	.4	
	98.3	Easy Agree.	24.3	**
		Agreement	39.1	****
		Hard Agree.	21.9	**
		Impas/Strk.	13.0	*
61. Length of school day/year.	11.5	Not Negot.	10.3	*
		Dropped	1.2	
	88.6	Easy Agree.	31.4	***
		Agreement	32.9	***
		Hard Agree.	16.9	**
		Impas/Strk.	7.4	*
48. Teacher assignment & transfer.	15.3	Not Negot.	11.8	*
		Dropped	3.5	
	84.6	Easy Agree.	18.9	**
		Agreement	41.4	****
		Hard Agree.	19.1	**
		Impas/Strk.	5.2	*
56. Teacher evaluation plans.	17.2	Not Negot.	15.0	**
		Dropped	2.2	
	82.8	Easy Agree.	24.6	**
		Agreement	40.7	****
		Hard Agree.	12.9	*
		Impas/Strk.	4.6	
51. Extra duty assignments.	20.4	Not Negot.	16.9	**
		Dropped	3.5	
	79.5	Easy Agree.	25.6	***
		Agreement	33.5	***
		Hard Agree.	15.5	**
		Impas/Strk.	4.9	
52. Extra duty compensation.	21.2	Not Negot.	16.0	**
		Dropped	5.2	*
	78.8	Easy Agree.	25.7	***
		Agreement	34.6	***
		Hard Agree.	14.1	*
		Impas/Strk.	4.4	

Table 8B. Topics of Frequent Negotiation
Frequency of Response for Individuals

CONTRACT CLAUSE			PERCENT	
55. Mentor teacher programs.	22.4	Not Negot.	19.4	**
		Dropped	3.0	
	77.6	Easy Agree.	43.0	****
		Agreement	24.4	**
		Hard Agree.	8.8	*
		Impas/Strk.	1.4	
59. Teacher preparation time.	26.1	Not Negot.	20.9	**
		Dropped	5.2	*
	73.9	Easy Agree.	16.6	**
		Agreement	31.3	***
		Hard Agree.	19.7	**
		Impas/Strk.	6.3	*
47. Class size.	30.3	Not Negot.	15.5	**
		Dropped	14.8	*
	69.8	Easy Agree.	16.0	**
		Agreement	35.0	****
		Hard Agree.	12.9	*
		Impas/Strk.	5.9	*
60. Use of lottery funds.	32.1	Not Negot.	28.3	***
		Dropped	3.8	
	67.9	Easy Agree.	16.6	**
		Agreement	25.5	***
		Hard Agree.	16.1	**
		Impas/Strk.	9.7	*
58. Teacher discipline procedures.	35.8	Not Negot.	29.8	***
		Dropped	6.0	*
	64.2	Easy Agree.	13.2	*
		Agreement	30.9	***
		Hard Agree.	15.7	**
		Impas/Strk.	4.4	
57. Staff development plans.	52.8	Not Negot.	50.9	*****
		Dropped	1.9	
	47.2	Easy Agree.	25.4	***
		Agreement	16.7	**
		Hard Agree.	4.4	
		Impas/Strk.	.7	
53. Staffing ratios for specialists.	61.7	Not Negot.	55.6	******
		Dropped	6.1	*
	38.2	Easy Agree.	14.1	*
		Agreement	17.9	**
		Hard Agree.	4.9	
		Impas/Strk.	1.3	
54. Merit/performance pay plans.	86.5	Not Negot.	76.7	*******
		Dropped	9.8	*
	13.6	Easy Agree.	2.9	
		Agreement	6.1	*
		Hard Agree.	3.5	
		Impas/Strk.	1.1	

Table 9. Topics of Non-Contractual Agreements
Frequency of Response for Individuals

TOPIC OF AGREEMENT		PERCENT
65. Teacher evaluation.	No Discuss.	2.0
	Dst. Policy	8.8 *
	Contract	54.1 *****
	Informal	2.3
	Formal Agree	32.5 ***
68. Classroom observation by management.	No Discuss.	9.1 *
	Dst. Policy	15.2 **
	Contract	45.8 *****
	Informal	5.2 *
	Formal Agree	24.2 **
71. Extra-curricular programs.	No Discuss.	24.7 **
	Dst. Policy	17.3 **
	Contract	34.0 ***
	Informal	8.0 *
	Formal Agree	15.8 **
64. Staff development programs.	No Discuss.	18.9 **
	Dst. Policy	38.4 ****
	Contract	13.9 *
	Informal	21.5 **
	Formal Agree	7.1 *
69. Career ladder programs.	No Discuss.	69.9 *******
	Dst. Policy	8.5 *
	Contract	11.0 *
	Informal	4.4
	Formal Agree	6.0 *
70. Differentiated staffing.	No Discuss.	70.5 *******
	Dst. Policy	9.2 *
	Contract	9.4 *
	Informal	5.1 *
	Formal Agree	5.8 *
63. Student discipline.	No Discuss.	18.1 **
	Dst. Policy	59.7 ******
	Contract	7.7 *
	Informal	6.8 *
	Formal Agree	7.2 *
62. Curriculum development or planning.	No Discuss.	21.1 **
	Dst. Policy	48.8 *****
	Contract	7.1 *
	Informal	16.3 **
	Formal Agree	6.4 *
67. Student assessment.	No Discuss.	29.9 ***
	Dst. Policy	51.6 *****
	Contract	4.2
	Informal	8.5 *
	Formal Agree	5.8 *
66. Homework assignments.	No Discuss.	24.9 **
	Dst. Policy	59.5 ******
	Contract	2.2
	Informal	7.9 *
	Formal Agree	5.6 *

Table 10. Personal Background and Experience
Frequency of Response for Individuals

VARIABLE LABEL		PERCENT	
72. Type of district office job.	Not in Dst Off	53.9	*****
	Supt/Asst Supt	19.3	**
	Business Mgr	.7	
	Personnel Off	4.3	
	Supervis/Coord	12.4	*
	Other Position	9.4	*
73. Type of job held at school site.	Not at School	40.2	****
	Principal/Asst	49.4	*****
	VP or Dean	6.6	*
	Dept. Chair	.2	
	Program Spec	.6	
	Other Position	3.1	
74. Is job classified confidential?	No	58.3	******
	Yes	41.7	****
75. If at site, what type school.	Elementary	42.0	***
	Middle	18.1	*
	High School	28.9	**
	Other/Special	7.2	
	Multi-site	3.8	
76. Number of years in present job.	Less than 2 yr	24.2	**
	2 - 3 years	16.6	**
	4 - 5 years	12.6	*
	6 - 7 years	11.2	*
	8 - 9 years	7.9	*
	10 or more yrs	27.5	***
77. Gender.	Male	66.5	*******
	Female	33.5	***
78. Age group.	Under 30	.2	
	30 - 34 yrs	2.2	
	35 - 39 yrs	12.9	*
	40 - 44 yrs	19.3	**
	45 - 49 yrs	20.4	**
	50 - 54 yrs	21.3	**
	55 - 59 yrs	18.9	**
	60 - 64 yrs	4.3	
	65 or older	.4	
79. Highest educational attainment.	BA-BS degree	6.7	*
	MA-MS degree	74.5	*******
	PhD or EdD	17.0	**
	Other degree	1.7	
80. Ever employed during a strike.	No	55.3	******
	As teacher	13.0	*
	As mgr/super	24.6	**
	As confid emp	1.6	
	As other	2.3	
	As tchr & mgr	2.9	
	Yes, other	.4	

Table 11. Personal Labor Relations Experiences
Frequency of Response for Individuals

VARIABLE LABEL			PERCENT	
81. Helped prepare negot. proposals.		No	37.4	****
		For mgt	36.1	****
		For tchrs	7.5	*
		For both	18.7	**
		Yes, other	.3	
82. Ever served on negotiating team.		No	44.9	****
		For mgt	33.5	***
		For tchrs	8.3	*
		For both	13.1	*
		Yes, other	.2	
83. Personally been object of grievance.		No	66.2	*******
		Yes	33.8	***
84. Union representing district teachers.		CTA	86.7	*******
		AFT	5.2	*
		UTLA	2.8	
		Other	2.4	
		No Union	1.8	
85. Average teacher salary.		Much Lower	2.4	
		Some Lower	16.3	**
		About Same	36.9	****
		Some Higher	35.7	****
		Much Higher	8.8	*
86. District financial condition.		Comfortable	9.4	*
		Sound	27.7	***
		Adequate	18.2	**
		Tight	34.2	***
		Troubled	10.5	*
87. Present status of negotiations.		Settled-Rout.	51.9	*****
	65.2	Settled-Tense	13.3	*
		Routine Neg.	13.3	*
	22.0	Tense Negot.	8.7	*
		At Impasse	12.4	*
	12.8	Work Stoppage	.4	
88. Grievances in past 12 months.		None	38.6	****
		One	11.3	*
		Two	11.4	*
		Three	9.2	*
		Four	6.4	*
		Five	3.9	
		Six	2.8	
		Seven	1.1	
		Eight	.6	
		Nine or more	14.6	*

Table 12. Labor Relations Practices & Alternatives
Frequency of Response for Individuals

VARIABLE LABEL		PERCENT	
89. Impasses declared in last 10 years.	None	30.4	***
	One	20.9	**
	Two	16.7	**
	Three	14.9	*
	Four	6.4	*
	Five	4.6	
	Six	1.6	
	Seven	1.2	
	Eight	1.0	
	Nine or more	2.2	
90. Strikes/work stoppages in 10 years.	None	64.1	******
	One	25.8	***
	Two	6.8	*
	Three	2.7	
	Four or more	.6	
91. Latest strike (% of those struck). A total of 34.4% reported strikes.	1985 or 1986	13.5	*
	1983 or 1984	19.4	**
	1981 or 1982	6.5	*
	1979 or 1980	17.7	**
	Before 1979	43.0	****
92. Total days lost due to strikes.	None	69.6	*******
	One	10.0	*
	Two	3.5	
	Three	3.0	
	Four	1.7	
	Five	2.1	
	Six or more	10.2	*
93. Number of multi-year contracts.	None	10.9	*
	One	14.7	*
	Two	19.5	**
	Three	37.2	****
	Four	13.0	*
	Five	4.6	
94. Chief management spokesperson.	Superintendent	20.8	**
	Personnel Mgr.	30.6	***
	Other Staff	19.6	**
	Board Member	1.4	
	Outside Cons.	27.6	***
95. Alternative labor practices?	No	80.2	*******
	Yes	19.8	**
96. Have alternatives been successful?	N/A	86.4	
	Not at all	5.1	*
	Somewhat	15.4	**
	Moderately	39.0	****
	Completely	40.4	****
97. Would alternatives work elsewhere?	N/A	86.9	
	Definitely Not	3.1	
	Probably Not	7.6	*
	Probably	67.9	*******
	Definitely	21.4	**
98. Description of alternative provided.	No (1104)	87.0	*******
	Yes (165)	13.0	*

THE FOLLOWING TABLES

PRESENT

RESPONSES TO THE

ACSA LABOR RELATIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

AGGREGATED BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

There are 503 school districts represented in the data. This means that, on the average, there were a bit more than 2 respondents per district (the range was from 1 to 38) among the 1,275 questionnaires used for these tables.

Responses are shown as the percentage of districts giving each answer (district answers were derived by averaging the responses of all individuals in each district). The *'s shown to the right of the response percentages represent a crude bar-graph. Except where noted, each * represents about 10% of the 503 districts in the sample.

For some items the overall mean score for all districts is shown in the last column of the table. For some items the total responses to related answers are shown to the left of the response labels.

Table 13. Views of Teacher Oraganizations
Responses Averaged Across Districts (N=503)

THE TEACHER ORGANIZATION. . .		PERCENT	MEAN
6. Is aligned with state organization.	Disagree	2.2	3.76
	8.7	6.5 *	
	Neutral	26.0 ***	
	65.2	43.9 ****	
	Agree	21.3 **	
1. Is well organized & strong.	Disagree	2.6	3.72
	14.6	12.0 *	
	Neutral	20.4 **	
	65.0	40.4 ****	
	Agree	24.6 **	
5. Supports improvement programs.	Disagree	2.2	3.63
	11.4	9.2 *	
	Neutral	31.4 ***	
	57.2	38.2 ****	
	Agree	19.0 **	
2. Has dedicated & competent leaders.	Disagree	2.8	3.60
	15.0	12.2 *	
	Neutral	25.0 ***	
	60.0	42.4 ****	
	Agree	17.6 **	
4. Is actively involved in politics.	Disagree	7.2 *	3.38
	21.0	13.8 *	
	Neutral	29.7 ***	
	49.3	32.9 ***	
	Agree	16.4 **	
8. Supports board candidates.	Disagree	9.9 *	3.34
	23.4	13.5 *	
	Neutral	29.3 ***	
	47.3	27.7 ***	
	Agree	19.6 **	
10. Acts responsibly.	Disagree	4.0	3.24
	26.0	22.0 **	
	Neutral	30.4 ***	
	43.6	32.9 ***	
	Agree	10.7 *	
7. Has leaders among best teachers.	Disagree	6.6 *	3.15
	30.5	23.9 **	
	Neutral	28.3 ***	
	41.1	29.9 ***	
	Agree	11.2 *	
3. Represents all teachers.	Disagree	7.4 *	3.12
	28.8	21.4 **	
	Neutral	32.4 ***	
	17.0	8.0 *	
	Agree	9.0 *	
9. Has strong community support.	Disagree	7.9 *	2.76
	36.8	28.9 ***	
	Neutral	45.9 *****	
	17.3	14.5 *	
	Agree	2.8	

Table 14. Views of School District Management
Responses Aggregated Across Districts (N=503)

THE MANAGEMENT . . .		PERCENT		MEAN
18. Is committed to school improvement.	Disagree	.2		4.55
2.0		1.8		
	Neutral	3.8		
94.2		31.2	***	
	Agree	63.0	******	
19. Acts responsibly with teachers.	Disagree	.4		4.31
3.0		2.6		
	Neutral	7.8	*	
89.2		43.9	****	
	Agree	45.3	*****	
13. Consists of competent individuals.	Disagree	1.2		4.28
3.4		2.2		
	Neutral	6.8	*	
89.8		47.0	*****	
	Agree	42.8	****	
17. Has full backing of school board.	Disagree	.4		4.11
8.0		7.6	*	
	Neutral	14.8	*	
77.2		34.6	***	
	Agree	42.6	****	
11. Is well organized & strong.	Disagree	1.8		4.01
7.0		5.2	*	
	Neutral	15.0	**	
78.0		46.2	*****	
	Agree	31.8	***	
15. Handles contract admin. well.	Disagree	1.6		3.98
5.8		4.2		
	Neutral	18.3	**	
75.9		46.2	*****	
	Agree	29.7	***	
14. Handles negotiations well.	Disagree	.6		3.98
7.8		7.2	*	
	Neutral	17.8	**	
74.4		42.3	****	
	Agree	32.1	***	
16. Has effective employee discipline.	Disagree	1.6		3.86
7.4		5.8	*	
	Neutral	19.4	**	
73.2		51.4	*****	
	Agree	21.8	**	
20. Uses effective team management.	Disagree	2.8		3.83
10.2		7.4	*	
	Neutral	20.7	**	
69.1		42.0	****	
	Agree	27.1	***	
12. Has strong community support.	Disagree	1.2		3.81
4.2		3.0		
	Neutral	24.7	**	
71.1		55.8	******	
	Agree	15.3	**	
21. Effectively evaluates teachers.	Disagree	1.6		3.73
9.2		7.6	*	
	Neutral	25.4	***	
65.4		46.6	*****	
	Agree	18.8	**	

Table 15. Views of School Boards
Responses Aggregated Across Districts (N=503)

THE SCHOOL BOARD. . .		PERCENT	MEAN
	Disagree	.4	
	1.8	1.4	
28. Supports school improvement pgms.	Neutral	5.8 *	4.52
	92.5	30.9 ***	
	Agree	61.6 ******	
	Disagree	.4	
	8.0	7.6 *	
23. Has competent dedicated people.	Neutral	17.7 **	4.01
	74.3	39.4 ****	
	Agree	34.9 ***	
	Disagree	1.6	
	5.6	4.0	
29. Has broad community support.	Neutral	23.3 **	3.91
	71.1	44.2 ****	
	Agree	26.9 ***	
	Disagree	.8	
	7.0	6.2 *	
24. Acts responsibly on labor issues.	Neutral	23.0 **	3.90
	70.0	42.0 ****	
	Agree	28.0 ***	
	Disagree	1.6	
	6.4	4.8	
32. Accepts teachers' right to bargain.	Neutral	21.2 **	3.85
	72.5	51.5 *****	
	Agree	21.0 **	
	Disagree	3.0	
	17.4	14.4 *	
22. Is cohesive in policy views.	Neutral	21.0 **	3.66
	61.6	36.8 ****	
	Agree	24.8 **	
	Disagree	1.8	
	12.2	10.4 *	
30. Takes tough bargaining stance.	Neutral	36.2 ****	3.49
	51.6	40.2 ****	
	Agree	11.4 *	
	Disagree	3.0	
	16.0	13.0 *	
31. Is concerned with quality over cost.	Neutral	33.2 ***	3.47
	50.8	35.6 ****	
	Agree	15.2 **	
	Disagree	10.2 *	
	31.0	20.8 **	
25. Has spirited debates/split votes.	Neutral	25.9 ***	3.18
	43.1	27.3 ***	
	Agree	15.8 **	
	Disagree	13.6 *	
	40.1	26.5 ***	
27. Believes unionization is good.	Neutral	44.5 ****	2.65
	15.4	12.6 *	
	Agree	2.8	
	Disagree	30.5 ***	
	55.8	25.3 ***	
26. Faced strong electoral opposition.	Neutral	24.1 **	2.43
	20.2	11.4 *	
	Agree	8.8 *	

Table 16A. Labor Relations Opinions
Responses Aggregated Across Districts (N=503)

LABOR RELATIONS OPINIONS . . .		PERCENT	MEAN
	Disagree	1.2	
5.2		4.0	
34. High teacher/supervisor trust.	Neutral	15.7 **	3.97
79.2		55.1 ******	
	Agree	24.1 **	
	Disagree	1.4	
5.6		4.2	
42. Cooperative relations possible.	Neutral	19.7 **	3.87
74.8		55.9 ******	
	Agree	18.9 **	
	Disagree	5.2 *	
16.8		11.6 *	
46. Well-managed means few grievances.	Neutral	24.1 **	3.59
59.2		37.3 ****	
	Agree	21.9 **	
	Disagree	3.6	
18.7		15.1 **	
43. Leads to decline in public supp.	Neutral	36.3 ****	3.37
45.0		30.7 ***	
	Agree	14.3 *	
	Disagree	7.6 *	
20.8		13.2 *	
45. Tchr Orgs can provide leadership.	Neutral	26.5 ***	3.41
52.7		36.5 ****	
	Agree	16.2 **	
	Disagree	5.8 *	
22.2		16.4 **	
37. Contracts undermine cooperation.	Neutral	29.2 ***	3.36
48.6		33.2 ***	
	Agree	15.4 **	
	Disagree	6.8 *	
23.1		16.3 **	
39. Contracts clarify rights/respons.	Neutral	28.9 ***	3.26
48.0		40.0 ****	
	Agree	8.0 *	

Table 168. Labor Relations Opinions
Responses Aggregated Across Districts (N=503)

LABOR RELATIONS OPINIONS . . .			PERCENT	MEAN
		Disagree	9.0 *	
	28.1		19.1 **	
33. High union/management trust.		Neutral	25.3 ***	3.25
	46.6		31.7 ***	
		Agree	14.9 *	
		Disagree	7.4 *	
	25.7		18.3 **	
40. Grievance proc. reduces conflict.		Neutral	37.8 ****	3.09
	36.5		31.1 ***	
		Agree	5.4 *	
		Disagree	7.2 *	
	30.5		23.3 **	
41. Teachers are too powerful.		Neutral	35.5 ****	3.03
	34.1		27.5 ***	
		Agree	6.6 *	
		Disagree	14.6 *	
	33.2		18.6 **	
44. Expect teachers to join unions.		Neutral	35.9 ****	2.92
	30.8		21.8 **	
		Agree	9.0 *	
		Disagree	17.0 **	
	40.4		23.4 **	
38. Managers ask tchrs, not unions.		Neutral	33.9 ***	2.76
	25.8		17.8 **	
		Agree	8.0 *	
		Disagree	16.8 **	
	39.8		23.0 **	
36. Restricting scope makes problems.		Neutral	39.7 ****	2.69
	20.6		15.6 **	
		Agree	5.0 *	
		Disagree	23.7 **	
	55.2		31.5 ***	
35. Collective bargaining is positive.		Neutral	29.1 ***	2.40
	15.8		12.4 *	
		Agree	3.4	

Table 17A. Frequency of Negotiating Various Issues
Responses Aggregated Across Districts (N=503)

TOPIC OF NEGOTIATION			PERCENT	
49. Basic teacher salaries.	.4	Not Negot.	.4	
		Dropped	.0	
	99.6	Easy Agree.	10.9	*
		Agreement	36.3	****
		Hard Agree.	30.9	***
		Impas/Strk.	21.5	**
50. Fringe benefit package.	1.4	Not Negot.	.8	
		Dropped	.6	
	98.6	Easy Agree.	19.7	**
		Agreement	45.0	*****
		Hard Agree.	22.8	**
		Impas/Strk.	11.1	*
61. Length of school day/year.	10.8	Not Negot.	7.2	*
		Dropped	3.6	
	89.2	Easy Agree.	32.6	***
		Agreement	36.0	****
		Hard Agree.	14.7	*
		Impas/Strk.	5.9	*
56. Teacher evaluation plans.	16.0	Not Negot.	10.2	*
		Dropped	5.8	*
	84.0	Easy Agree.	28.9	***
		Agreement	40.2	****
		Hard Agree.	11.7	*
		Impas/Strk.	3.2	
48. Teacher assignment & transfer.	17.3	Not Negot.	12.4	*
		Dropped	4.9	
	82.8	Easy Agree.	22.0	**
		Agreement	41.6	****
		Hard Agree.	17.3	**
		Impas/Strk.	1.9	
51. Extra duty assignments.	19.3	Not Negot.	14.0	*
		Dropped	5.3	*
	80.6	Easy Agree.	29.6	***
		Agreement	31.7	***
		Hard Agree.	15.5	**
		Impas/Strk.	3.8	
52. Extra duty compensation.	21.7	Not Negot.	15.7	**
		Dropped	6.0	*
	78.2	Easy Agree.	26.5	***
		Agreement	34.7	***
		Hard Agree.	14.4	*
		Impas/Strk.	2.6	
47. Class size.	25.6	Not Negot.	13.4	*
		Dropped	12.2	*
	74.4	Easy Agree.	24.6	**
		Agreement	34.2	***
		Hard Agree.	12.4	*
		Impas/Strk.	3.2	

Table 17B. Frequency of Negotiating Various Issues
Responses Aggregated Across Districts (N=503)

TOPIC OF NEGOTIATION			PERCENT	
55. Mentor teacher programs.	27.7	Not Negot.	20.3	**
		Dropped	7.4	*
	72.3	Easy Agree.	42.7	****
		Agreement	23.5	**
		Hard Agree.	5.7	*
		Impas/Strk.	.4	
59. Teacher preparation time.	28.5	Not Negot.	20.5	**
		Dropped	8.0	*
	71.4	Easy Agree.	20.3	**
		Agreement	28.9	***
		Hard Agree.	17.9	**
		Impas/Strk.	4.3	
60. Use of lottery funds.	33.9	Not Negot.	24.4	**
		Dropped	9.5	*
	66.2	Easy Agree.	21.5	**
		Agreement	23.2	**
		Hard Agree.	14.1	*
		Impas/Strk.	7.4	*
58. Teacher discipline procedures.	34.8	Not Negot.	24.6	**
		Dropped	10.2	*
	65.2	Easy Agree.	21.3	**
		Agreement	28.9	***
		Hard Agree.	11.3	*
		Impas/Strk.	3.7	
57. Staff development plans.	58.0	Not Negot.	42.5	****
		Dropped	15.5	**
	42.1	Easy Agree.	24.9	**
		Agreement	14.8	*
		Hard Agree.	2.4	
		Impas/Strk.	.0	
53. Staffing ratios for specialists.	65.4	Not Negot.	49.7	*****
		Dropped	15.7	**
	34.6	Easy Agree.	18.5	**
		Agreement	10.9	*
		Hard Agree.	4.1	
		Impas/Strk.	1.1	
54. Merit/performance pay plans.	87.6	Not Negot.	70.5	*******
		Dropped	17.1	**
	12.4	Easy Agree.	6.1	*
		Agreement	3.7	
		Hard Agree.	2.2	
		Impas/Strk.	.4	

Table 18. Frequency of Non-Contractual Agreements
Responses Aggregated Across Districts (N=503)

TOPIC OF AGREEMENT		PERCENT
65. Teacher evaluation.	No Discuss.	1.0
	Dst. Policy	7.1 *
	Contract	45.9 *****
	Informal	25.4 ***
	Formal Agree	20.1 **
68. Classroom observation by management.	No Discuss.	7.3 *
	Dst. Policy	12.5 *
	Contract	43.9 ****
	Informal	21.4 **
	Formal Agree	14.8 *
71. Extra-curricular programs.	No Discuss.	21.3 **
	Dst. Policy	19.1 **
	Contract	35.5 ****
	Informal	14.5 *
	Formal Agree	9.6 *
64. Staff development programs.	No Discuss.	16.2 **
	Dst. Policy	35.3 ****
	Contract	23.1 **
	Informal	21.6 **
	Formal Agree	3.6
62. Curriculum development or planning.	No Discuss.	17.9 **
	Dst. Policy	45.2 *****
	Contract	19.1 **
	Informal	14.5 *
	Formal Agree	3.4
63. Student discipline.	No Discuss.	14.6 *
	Dst. Policy	58.4 ******
	Contract	14.2 *
	Informal	8.4 *
	Formal Agree	4.4
69. Career ladder programs.	No Discuss.	65.8 *******
	Dst. Policy	15.6 **
	Contract	11.8 *
	Informal	4.3
	Formal Agree	2.5
67. Student assessment.	No Discuss.	24.7 **
	Dst. Policy	53.1 *****
	Contract	10.5 *
	Informal	8.0 *
	Formal Agree	3.7
70. Differentiated staffing.	No Discuss.	67.1 *******
	Dst. Policy	16.9 **
	Contract	9.8 *
	Informal	4.0
	Formal Agree	2.1
66. Homework assignments.	No Discuss.	19.9 **
	Dst. Policy	58.5 ******
	Contract	9.4 *
	Informal	9.2 *
	Formal Agree	2.9

Table 19. Labor Relations Conditions and Practices
Responses Aggregated Across Districts (N=503)

VARIABLE LABEL			PERCENT	
84. Union representing district teachers.		CTA (441)	88.0	*******
		AFT (35)	7.0	*
		UTLA (1)	.2	
		Other (11)	2.0	
		No Union (14)	2.8	
85. Average teacher salary.		Much Lower	1.6	
		Some Lower	13.3	*
		About Same	37.0	****
		Some Higher	36.8	****
		Much Higher	11.3	*
86. District financial condition.		Comfortable	8.0	*
		Sound	27.5	***
		Adequate	24.8	**
		Tight	29.9	***
		Troubled	9.8	*
87. Present status of negotiations.		Settled-Rout.	47.1	*****
	66.1	Settled-Tense	19.0	**
		Routine Neg.	13.2	*
	21.2	Tense Negot.	8.0	*
		At Impasse	12.2	*
	12.6	Work Stoppage	.4	
88. Grievances in past 12 months.		None	40.5	****
		One	11.7	*
		Two	11.7	*
		Three	10.6	*
		Four	7.0	*
		Five	3.9	
		Six	3.6	
		Seven	2.2	
		Eight	.8	
		Nine or more	7.8	*
89. Impasses declared in last 10 years.		None	27.5	***
		One	22.1	**
		Two	20.6	**
		Three	13.3	*
		Four	7.1	*
		Five	4.7	
		Six	2.9	
		Seven	.2	
		Eight	.5	
		Nine or more	1.0	
90. Strikes/work stoppages in 10 years.		None	69.6	*******
		One	22.1	**
		Two	6.6	*
		Three	1.3	
		Four	.4	
91. Latest strike (% of those struck).		1985 or 1986	13.7	*
		1983 or 1984	12.2	*
		1981 or 1982	6.9	*
		1979 or 1980	12.2	*
		Before 1979	26.7	***

Table 20. Labor Relations Practices
Responses Aggregated Across Districts (N=503)

VARIABLE LABEL		PERCENT	
92. Total days lost due to strikes.	None	74.3	*******
	One	11.5	*
	Two	2.7	
	Three	1.8	
	Four	.7	
	Five	1.8	
	Six or more	7.3	*
93. Number of multi-year contracts.	None	10.4	*
	One	11.6	*
	Two	24.7	**
	Three	39.2	****
	Four	10.4	*
	Five	3.6	
94. Chief management spokesperson.	Superintendent	25.2	***
	Personnel Mgr.	22.7	**
	Other Staff	21.1	**
	Board Member	2.0	
	Outside Cons.	28.8	***
95. Alternative labor practices?	No Resp. (83)	16.5	**
	No (295)	58.6	******
	Possibly (62)	12.4	*
	Yes (63)	12.5	*
96. Have alternatives been successful?	N/A	75.0	
	Not at all	9.5	*
	Somewhat	20.6	**
	Moderately	32.5	***
	Completely	37.3	****
97. Would alternatives work elsewhere?	N/A	75.5	
	Definitely Not	4.9	
	Probably Not	17.9	**
	Probably	56.1	******
	Definitely	21.1	**
98. Description of alternative given.	None (382)	75.9	*******
	Some (71)	14.2	*
	All (50)	9.9	*

Table 21. Stepwise Multiple Regression Equation

for Dependent Variable -

Opinion Question #33: The level of trust and cooperation between the teacher organization and the administration in my district is quite high.

as predicted by

Various objective labor relations problems.

Multiple R-squared = .23 F = 31.2, p = .000

Variables Predicting Trust Levels	Zero-Order Correlation	Regression Coefficient
Number of Grievances in last 12 months	-.358	-.296
Current Status of Negotiations	-.284	-.144
Number of Impasses Declared in last 10 years	-.351	-.145
Number of Multi-year Contracts Negotiated	.049	.101
Other Labor Relations Problem Indicators		
Number of Strikes in the last 10 Years	-.232	not sig.
Year of Most Recent Strike	-.224	not sig.
Number of Days Lost to Strikes over 10 Years	-.211	not sig.

Table 22. Stepwise Multiple Regression Equation

for Dependent Variable -

Opinion Question #33: The level of trust and cooperation between the teacher organization and the administration in my district is quite high.

as predicted by

Views Regarding Teacher Organizations.

Multiple R-squared = .23 F = 31.2, p = .000

Variables Predicting Trust Levels	Zero-Order Correlation	Regression Coefficient
10. Acts Responsibly	.490	.379
7. Has Leaders from Among Best Teachers	.374	.105
4. Is Active in Politics	-.105	-.118
5. Supports School Improvement Programs	.343	.123
3. Adequately Represents All Teachers	.345	.068
Other Teacher Organization Views		
2. Has Dedicated & Competent Leaders	.323	not sig.
9. Has Strong Community Support	.226	not sig.
1. Is Well Organized and Strong	.106	not sig.
6. Is Aligned with Goals of State Organization	.013	not sig.
8. Publicly Supports Board Candidates	-.007	not sig.

Table 23. Stepwise Multiple Regression Equation

for Dependent Variable -

Opinion Question #33: The level of trust and cooperation between the teacher organization and the administration in my district is quite high.

as predicted by

Views Regarding District Management.

Multiple R-squared = .23 F = 31.2, p = .000

Variables Predicting Trust Levels	Zero-Order Correlation	Regression Coefficient
14. Handles Contract Negotiations Well	.465	.336
20. Uses a Team Management Approach	.412	.276
12. Has Strong Community Support	.410	.161
21. Is Effective in Teacher Evaluation	.325	.074
Other District Management Views		
19. Acts Responsibly in Dealing with Teachers	.390	not sig.
15. Handles Contract Administration Well	.378	not sig.
11. Is Well Organized and Strong	.369	not sig.
13. Is Made Up of Competent Individuals	.345	not sig.
16. Deals Well with Employee Discipline	.320	not sig.
18. Is Committed to School Improvement	.306	not sig.
17. Has Full Backing of the Board	.297	not sig.

Table 24. Stepwise Multiple Regression Equation

for Dependent Variable -

Opinion Question #33: The level of trust and cooperation between the teacher organization and the administration in my district is quite high.

as predicted by

Views Regarding District Management.

Multiple R-squared = .23 F = 31.2, p = .000

Variables Predicting Trust Levels	Zero-Order Correlation	Regression Coefficient
24. Acts Responsibly on Labor Issues	.318	.241
31. Is More Concerned with Quality than Cost	.296	.197
30. Takes a Tough Bargaining Stance	.004	-.133
29. Has Broad Community Support	.278	.170
27. Believes Unionization has been Good	.155	.137
26. Faced Strong Opposition in Elections	-.065	-.052
Other School Board Views		
22. Is Cohesive in Policy Views	.266	not sig.
23. Is Made Up of Competent Dedicated People	.252	not sig.
25. Has Spirited Debates, Split Votes	-.037	not sig.
28. Supports School Improvement Programs	.244	not sig.
32. Accepts Teachers Right to Bargain	.186	not sig.
18. Is Committed to School Improvement	.306	not sig.
17. Has Full Backing of the Board	.297	not sig.

Table 25. Stepwise Multiple Regression Equation

for Dependent Variable -

Opinion Question #33: The level of trust and cooperation between the teacher organization and the administration in my district is quite high.

as predicted by

Views Regarding Teachers, Management & School Board

Multiple R-squared = .44 F = 86.4, p = .000

Variables	Zero-Order Correlation	Regression Coefficient
10 Tchr Org: Acts Responsibly	.490	.295
14 Managmt: Handles Negotiations Well	.465	.191
20 Managmt: Uses Team Approach	.412	.131
12 Managmt: Has Strong Commty Support	.410	.119
30 Board: Tough Bargaining Stance	.004	-.116
31 Board: Quality Concern Over Cost	.296	.067
4 Tchr Org: Active in Politics	-.105	-.067
7 Tchr Org: Leaders from Best Tchrs	.374	.092
26 Board: Faced Electoral Opposition	-.065	-.051
19 Managmt: Responsible with Tchrs.	.390	.061
29 Board: Has Broad Commty Support	.278	.052